BAP
F525.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. SCB 10546

A Serious

QUESTION STATED:

Viz:

Whether the Ministers of *England* are bound by the Word of God to Baptize the Children of all such Parents which say, they beleeve in Jesus Christ; but are grosly ignorant, scandalous in their Conversations, Scoffers at Godlinesse, and refuse to submit to Church-Discipline?

THE

Negative (with submission to better Judgements,) is modestly defended. Some things that concerne our Congregationall Churches are, in the Epistle to the Reader briefly touched.

AS ALSO

A little Addition made to the Controversie against the *Anabaptists*, in the following Discourse,

By *G: Firmin*, Minister to the Church in *Shalford* in *Essex*.

1 COR: 4. 2. *Moreover it is required in Stewards that a man be found faithfull.*

LONDON Printed by *R: I:* for *Stephen Bowtell* at the signe of the Bible in Popes head-Alley. MDCLI.

PROPERTY OF
NEW EDITION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

TO THE Courteous Reader.

IT *is very uncomfortable when two Physitians shall joyne together to cure the same sicke person, that these two cannot agree, neither in the Disease what it is, nor in the causes of the Disease, nor in their prognosticks, nor in their indications of cure. It is so with us in regard of* England *(the sick Patient) the children of God [and especially those who are such in the Magistracy and Ministery] should be they (under God) who should help to heale the Nation: But such is the different judgement among these, they neither agree in the Causes of the Disease, nor in the indications of Cure, nor in their prognosticks; but some foretell glorious healthfull dayes comming, nay, the light already appeares: Some others say, they are very sad daies, and fear what will become of the sicke Nation.* Rob. Purnell * *wonders to hear any say they are sad times, in his learned Epistle (forsooth) to the Presbyteriall Ministers, wherein he takes upon him to imitate Christ, telling them (as other Churches) what he observes commendable in them, but then tells them he hath a few things against them, (Sir, a little more*

* In his word to the Presbyterians. They do but dreame he saith, in saying these are bad times, p. 66.

reverence would wel have become you;) then he falls upon them for saying they are sad times. If I should say the Church injoyes nothing desirable, I should bee very injurious to God and Man; I shall at the end of my discourse set down a great benefit we have, but yet let me tell him, in divers respects they may well be called sad times. As

1 *Sad times, When Apostacy among Professours abounds.*

2 *Sad times, When the converting power of the Ordinances is gone; we see not God in this respect as we have done heretofore, whether any men (as second causes) in casting scorn upon the Ministery, be any hinderance here* [*what ever the Decrees of God be, which are none of our rules*] *let them provide to answer for that.*

3 *Sad times, When God is so dark to his own people, who have found him heretofore, could walk in the light of his countenance and have their conversations in some measure as become Saints, but now they walke in the dark, and are so beset with temptations, that they have much a doe to hold up, yet God seems not to regard prayers. Most sincere Christians that I meet with, complain of this.*

4 *Sad times, When those for whom Christ hath shed his blood, are ready to shed the blood one of another.*

5 *Sad times, When Christians that injoy all the Ordinances and Liberties which Christ hath left to his Church, yet they cannot tell how to walk humbly and regularly under them, but if a whim take them in the head, Officers must stoop to their humours and errors, or else they crack, and rend all into peeces, making no more of unity* [*for which Christ prayed, and to which* Paul *from Christ so much exhorted*] *then of the dirt under their shooes.*

6 *Sad times, When Errors, Heresies and Schismes abound, yea, and those who seemed to be true Christians, shall receive that for true doctrine, which before they would have abhorred,*

as the doctrine of Arminianisme, *which doctrin I wonder how any that have any experience of God in their own hearts can receive: nay, if it were true, they cannot receive it, it is so opposite to what experience* [*besides the Word*] *witnesse daily.*

Was not the Idoll of free-will heretofore esteemed among Christians as an Image of jealousie; if any had in their Sermons set it up, would not they with indignation have cryed it downe? but now that poison is drunk downe and esteemed wholsome liquor.

Is it not sufficient to say the will acts as freely in Conversion, [*is as clear from all coaction*] *as it did in sinning? it is lead by as pure rational grounds, and complains not of the least hinderance of its freedom, witnesse those strong desires, earnest affections wherewith the soule is carried till it come to injoy Christ Jesus, and that sweet joy and content the heart findeth in possessing of him: the wil was free sure in this; nay I think it no false divinity to say, that* quantum ad actus elicitos, *The will cannot be compelled by the blessed God himself. For What is such an act but* inclinatio quædam procedens ab interiori principio cognoscente; *and since that* motus coactus sit à principio extrinseco passo non conferente vim, *i.e.* resistente per propriam inclinationem, tum si voluntas, cogi potest ad volendum aliquid, vellet & nollet idem objectum, quod est impossibile.

But though I say the will is thus free, yet I say with Alvarez. Deus per auxilium gratiæ prævenientis, elevat intellectum & voluntatem, & eam movet, ut eliciat actus supernaturales: sive illi sint liberi, aut deliberati, sivè indeliberati: cum ante hujusmodi auxilium, nullam habeat proximam virtutem; vel activitatem intellectus noster & voluntas, ad eliciendos actus supernaturales, etiam inde liberatos, & ut aiunt, primo primos. De Auxil. div. gra. disp. 57.

Disp. 19. *I say also with him,* quod omnis causa secunda, sivè naturalis, sive libera in ordine ad illud prævium auxilium Dei, se habet Passivè. *Though a man be converted, and have grace.*

There is enough said in his 18, 20, 21, 22, 23. Disputations *to crush this Idol.*

I could quote enough out of Bradwardin *also,* l.1. c.40, 41,42. *and* l.2.c.7. *and* 9. *But I will content my selfe with one passage which did much move me when I read it.* De causa Dei, l.3.c.29. Dico, illum nolo pro Deo nostro habere, qui non sit omnipotens in agendo, qui non habeat omnipotentissimum dominatum super meam debilem voluntatem, qui non posset omnipotentissimè facere me velle & facere quicquid vellet, qui non habeat voluntatem universaliter efficacem, infrustrabilem & necessariam in causando, imo cujus voluntas non sit mihi necessitas, &c. *Could an Arch-Bishop of* Canterbury *in the midnight of Popery* [*for it is above* 300 *years since* Bradwardin *dyed*] *and could an Arch Bishop of* Spaine, *see so much cause to exalt* Free grace, *and debase* Free will, *and shall English Professors now cry up this Idoll, when Grace and Christ have been so long taught?*

So that other vile uncomfortable error, of finall falling away from true grace once received.

Is the Surety of the new Covenant grown so poor? Heb: 7.22.

Is the Promise now come to be nay, and yea? 2 Cor: 1.20.

Is the Power of God grown weak? 1 Pet: 1.5. *can it not preserve my faith also?*

Is the Decreeing will of God become mutable? 2 Tim: 2.19.

Is the Free Eternall Love of God, become unconstant? Joh: 13.1.

De causa Dei. l.1.c.43. *What saith* Bradwardin: Credo, quòd Deus intrinsecè quantum

quantum scilicet ad actum seu affectum intrinsecum voluntatis, semper omnino æqualiter, æquè gratuitò, æque charè dilexit, diligit, & diliget, justificandum, seu justificatum quemcunque, puta Paulum, antè conversionem, in ipsa, & post ipsam.

Alvarez *saith*, Perseverantia est Donum, non omnibus commune sed prædestinatorum proprium, *so say we; but he saith moreover.* Donum perseverantiæ, in ratione Doni perseverantiæ, & efficatia illius, non dependet etiam ut a conditione, sine qua non, ex cooperatione nostri arbitrii, sed ex proposito, decreto Dei absoluto efficiente, ut homo usque in finem perseveret. De auxil div. gra. disp. 107. n. 2. Ib: disp. 122. n. 18.

There is a 7th. *yet to adde. Sad times, When godly men shall take up such principles which if they be followed, wil undermine and destroy all our reformation, which have cost so many prayers, and such vast expences of estates, lives, and blood. Let this be one,* If errors be not in the fundamentalls, we should indeed labour to convince Christians, but if we cannot, we must go no further, but must carry our selves to such persons in all Church respects as we do to the Orthodox and Godly. *When we aske what do you cal fundamentals? we find they are pent up in a very narrow compasse: a foundation we know is that which lyeth in the lowest place of the building, and beareth up all that is built upon it; and remove that, you destroy the building: That then must be a fundamentall point upon which our salvation is so built, as deny that, and you destroy our salvation.* Arminianism *is denied to be within this compasse of fundamentals, by these godly men as I have heard them, yea, such men as I am sure are clear enough from* Arminianism, *and such as I much reverence. Then let us follow this opinion.*

Suppose then there be in a Church some members who deny Baptisme, they acknowledge no such thing, neither of Infants

nor

nor others, but onely the inward baptisme of the spirit (as I know such) these then you must labour to convince, but if they will not be convinced you must proceed no further, [for I beleeve you will not say a man cannot be saved without Baptism, that then is no fundamentall point] these persons being let alone infect others: so at last Baptisme is lost in that Church, and if it be lost in one Church, it may be in two, &c.

So for the Lords Supper; suppose others should deny that, as I know one who hath been reputed for a very godly Christian, and is I beleeve still so reputed by many. A brother of mine being in discourse with this person about the Lords Supper, the Party did affirme unto him, He might goe to the Bakers shop, and take a Loafe there, and it would doe him as much good as that, *i. e. the bread in the* Sacrament. *We know if we consider the Bread as bread only, that bread will doe no good; but the Party spake in way of scorne of the Sacrament, as the speech also implyes. Suppose many more be of that minde in a* Church, *as now we know how many are above Ordinances; yea, and I have heard them who I beleeve are truly godly, say for the* Sacraments, *they are* externall things; *[but with your favour, they have Divine Authority for their institution, they have the Spirit of God to attend them] and so long as they had Preaching and Prayer they did not much stand upon them, though I am perswaded they would enjoy them if they could to their minde: but if once this notion, they are* externall things [*and so are all Ordinances, though some the light of Nature doe more dictate, others are more* juris positivi] *be taken in, we may feare what will be next; now I say, suppose your Members should deny the Lords Supper, you must labour to convince them, but proceed no further; for I hope you do not tye salvation to this; if so, then those Ministers have done very ill, that have had no* Sacraments *for divers yeares together: The Lords Supper, that is gone also by this opinion.*

So

So for Discipline, that the Erastians *tell us, doth not belong to the Church, but to the Civill Magistrate; and some Churches have wanted it also: That is gone also by this opinion.*

For singing of Psalmes, that is esteemed rediculous, and omitted by abundance of Church Members. Some deny the Ordinance, (as I know such) some omit it under a whim of the mixed multitude, such we have in some Churches, whose consciences are very tender, for joyning with mixed multitudes in such Ordinances; but if you aske what persons are these in their conversations, I can say, that for pride, and for following of fashions they are so noted, that most doe abhor them, where they live. O tender Conscience.

We have no Ordinances left then, but Prayer and Preaching, for preaching by persons in office, that is cried downe, a gifted Brother is as good as any Black-coate. As for Prayer, when the Spirit moves us [suppose but once in a moneth, or quarter of a yeare] then we will pray, and not else; so that for my part I cannot see but this Opinion will stub up all the Ordinances; where then is our Reformation that hath cost so much?

These few things I have mentioned, that Rob. Purnell *may see the Presbyteriall Ministers are not in a dreame when they say, they are sad times; when God heals these things, I beleeve they will say, they are good times.*

If you say, No, I doubt they will not, they must have your Congregationall Churches downe first.

I beleeve for many of them, sober, moderate, learned, and godly men, they doe not stand upon that, if Congregationall men would but forbeare one thing; and for my part [with respect to our Congregationall men] I must needs joyne *with the Presbyteriall brethren in that point, as I have done ever since I came into* England: *that is in this. Suppose a godly*

Dedham,

Miniſterable, &c. liveth in a Pariſh, he hath twenty or more, it may be a hundred, nay two hundred viſible Saints in his Pariſh; they all have this liberty, if any come to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, who are known to any of the Brethren to be guilty of ſome ſins, which make them unfit for the Ordinance. Let them come in and teſtifie againſt them, [which they muſt doe in any Church however conſtituted] they are debarred unleſſe they can give ſatisfaction, all perſons are, beſides all examined by the Officers; the Brethren have free power given them in election of Officers [as in Dedham] *where the Miniſters gave the people ſo much liberty in the choyce of their ruling Elders, that they would not ſo much as nominate any, but freely left it to the Fraternity, to nominate the perſons whom they would have, as the caſe ſtood in that Church there might be ſome reaſon, but elſe I ſhould (under favour) blame thoſe Miniſters for doing ſo; were not you members of the Church as well as they? and ought not you, (having more skill to judge of the fitneſſe of a perſon for the Office) to have gone before them in the Election?] but yet all this will not doe, though they called the Miniſter, or Miniſters to the place, have joyned with them in all Ordinances before, conſtantly attended upon their Miniſtery, have this liberty granted, and may partake in Ordinances without ſinne, yet a great part of theſe depart from the Officer, from the Church, Schiſmatically [I cannot eſteeme it leſſe] and another Miniſter living by, he takes theſe into his Church. Holy* Hooker *thought*, To ſeparate from Congregations for want of ſome Ordinances, or to ſeparate from the true Worſhip of God, becauſe of the ſinne of ſome Worſhippers, is unlawfull.

His Preface to his ſurvey of Chur. D.ſc.

If Congregationall men would take what they finde in their owne Pariſhes, and if there be another Pariſh by, where there is no Miniſter [as ſuch there are] or if ſo few fit to partake of

the

the Lords Supper, that the Miniſter cannot with comfort adminiſter it in his owne Pariſh, and ſo himſelfe, and the few he hath joyne with this Church; or if a Miniſter will give his conſent to let his people joyne with this Congregationall Church; I know the Presbyteriall Miniſters will allow this, for they practiſe it themſelves, if indeed there be no Miniſter in a place, and afterward a godly man be choſen into the Pariſh then they would reſigne up thoſe Members which live in his Pariſh to him againe, and this is good; for my part, thoſe who will not be content with this, but will practiſe according to that dividing Principle *that ſome doe, to take away the godly Chriſtians againſt a godly Miniſters conſent, when he hath ſufficient comfortably to goe through all Ordinances, that man ſhall not be eſteemed in my heart for one who followeth peace, but a ſeeker of diviſion.*

If any Chriſtian have a minde to enjoy ſomething which may be had in another Church, let him. [*I know what could be ſaid here*] *remove his dwelling into that Towne, and then there is no offence given; if you thinke it will hinder you a little in your eſtate, &c. friend, they who went to* New England *for true Liberty of Conſcience, payed dearer for it then you doe here.*

Neither am I ſatisfied concerning the practiſes of ſome Congregationall Churches here, as 1. *In that ridged examination they make of their Members (ſome I am ſure, whether all their Members are ſo examined I know not:) The Rules I have ſet downe are theſe.* 1. A Perſon profeſſing the ſenſe of his undone condition by ſinne, an utter emptineſſe in himſelfe to help himſelfe out from that condition, and ſo profeſſeth his relying upon Jeſus Chriſt only for ſalvation. 2. His knowledge competent. 3. His Converſation ſuch as doth not croſſe his Profeſſion, by living in any knowne ſinne, or omitting any knowne

duty. 4. His subjection to Discipline. *I goe by these rules, and thinke they are as straight as the rules the Apostles went by; but I am blamed by some for being too large, and have other notions buzzed into the Heads of my people, [though (through mercy) I know of none of my people, either fly-blown with the errours of the times, nor any crack among us, but we are all one, the Lord continue it:] As persons who are admitted into Churches must give an account from point to point, how God carried them on in conversion; also some Church must have the Members give account, in what Promises God hath manifested Himselfe to them, as requisite to their admission. For these persons and practises I shall give them one word at the end of my Booke.*

Bellarm. Ener. Tom. 2. l. 2. c. 1. no. 5.

Learned Amesius [*to whom the Congregationall men are not a little beholden, and I am sure he is much honoured among us*] *saith, in answer to* Bellarmin: *It is false, that inward reall graces are required of the reformed Churches, to make a man a member of a visible Church; his words carry that sence I am sure:* Falsum est, internas virtutes requiri a nobis, ut aliquis sit in Ecclesia quoad visibilem ejus statum. *I wrong not his sence though I put in other words.*

The Synod of New Engla d, Confes. of Chur. dis. c. 12. p. 3.

The Churches of New England *say, In admission, severity of examination must be avoyded.*

For my part, I locke at the conversation most, that is, Argumentum artificiale; *all their Relations, Discourses, [though some, where conversation answer, it is excellent to heare their relations of Gods working] are but* Argumenta inartificilia.

1 *That strictnesse which will content Christ in his visible Kingdome may well content us.*

2 *Neither am I satisfied in this: The putting of persons to make their Relations of the work of Grace, before all the Church. The Brethren say they will have it so; and here we must have a great*

great many persons to please, and their wills *must be the rule of admission.*

To have persons examined by the Elders [*to whose office it doth belong, and not to the Fraternity, by your leave*] *and to have those relations brought to the Fraternity by the Elders, and owned by the person as in Gods presence, this will not give content, but all the brethren must hear the person himself, or herself make the relation before them: And now we have* John *and* Robert, &c. *to please, they have some thing to question, and the person must suite all their humors, or else some stir is made. It is a miserable thing when the pleasing of severall mens humours is made the rule of admission. Let those* Johns *and* Roberts *observe what is the Market measure, and bring their spirits to that, and let not every mans spirit be the measure in admissions,* Hook. Surv. Chur. D. 5 pa. 3. c. 1.

Object. But we must know them whom we admit into our Society?

Ans: *So you do in their Conversation as well as your Officers, and this is the maine. The other also you know mediately by your Officers.*

The best Scripture that ever I heard alledged by these, is that of 1 Pet. 3. 15. *But if you straine that place to prove that every one that is to be admitted into a Church, must personally give a relation before all the Church of the worke of God upon them from point to point, I doubt you will wring the* Text *till blood come. Much might be said concerning this Text, but I leave it. Other Scriptures I have heard alledged to prove this, but so weakly that I will not name them.*

That is not the way of admission, wherein the least Lamb of Christ should be beaten off.

But in this way, many lambs of Christ must be beaten off; for do we think all true Christians are able to give an account

before a whole Church? Nay, I know the contrary, many are so fearful, confounded (as I may say) they know not what to say, and hence sometimes go away with discouragement.

Besides, do not Ministers know what pains they are forced to take with some poor Christians when they are alone, to draw out from them, what God hath done for them, [*like* Daniel, *they must go and tell* Nebuchadnezzar *his dream*] *and these very godly ones, but to put these to speak before others, is to have them say nothing.*

See Mr. *Hooker* also in his Church. See Surv. of Church dis. part. 3. p. 6.

In New England *divers Churches admit women thus by their relating first to the Elder, or Elders, and then to the Church, but many women are more able to speak and relate the worke of God on their hearts then many men are, and yet godly persons also.*

Object. But you Elders are apt to be corrupted, and you may so deceive us.

Answ. *But their conversation you know, whether it doth contradict the relation made by your Elders.*

Do you think that persons making their relations before you, is the sure way to keep out all Hypocrites, if so; you said something. But I have knowne by experience such as have made relations of the worke of God on their hearts from point to point, before all the Congregation, whom yet at that time I did feare to be but rotten, and so it proved.

Mr. *Wooster* of *Salisbury.*

But to put an end to this, Let me give the Reader one story, There was a godly poor plaine woman in New England, *who lay sick* [*which sickness ended her life*] *the* * *Pastor of the Church went to visit her, and treating with her concerning eternity, how she was provided, the woman it seems did never use to speak, but little, but now she opened her heart more:* O Sir, *said she,* to the Minister, when the Sabbath came, I was in heaven, &c. *The Minister told me that if that woman had been received as others were in some Churches, she must*

must never have been joyned to the Church: tell me I pray you how many of our Church Members are in heaven, when the Sabbath comes. Away then with ridgednesse, and these wayes of admission, whereby many a sincere heart may bee beaten off.

What our Congregationall Churches do with Errours I know not, for I am but seldome abroad to inquire; but the generall frame of Independents *is, to be very large in that way of tollerating such stuffe in the Churches: I shal say no more but this, I know the Elders of* New England *very wel, their learning, holinesse, close-walking with God, their strictnesse against errors in their Churches, if our Congregationall Churches be not so, but are gone beyond* New England, *I only say, farewell.*

Now to give an account to the Reader why I appear in Print, [being conscious to my selfe of my owne weaknesse, being broken from my study in the prime of my years, from eighteen years of age to twenty eight, and what time I could get in them years I spent in the study and practise of Physick in that wildernes, til these times changed, and then I changed my studies to Divinity:] The reason, I say, of my appearing thus is this. I being branded by Mr. Edwards *for an* Independent, *in the first part of his* Gangrene, *where there is one whole Letter concerns me, and that is all false, being meerly mistakes, the next Letter (half of it) concerns me also, and [excepting that I preached and was not in* orders*] that also is false. I beleive the Gentleman that wrote those Letters, if they were now to be written would not do it. I cannot point the Reader in what page to find those Letters, for I have not the book. But being by him branded thus, and so others looked upon me, when I was ordained, I did declare to the Elders and the Congregation, how farre I owned* Independency, *that is.* That a Church Organized and walking regularly, might execute all the pow-

er

er of the Keyes within it selfe. *But if this were the meaning of it, viz. Here is a Church, and we have all power within our selves, therefore wee will practise* thus, *or* so *as we please, and wee will maintaine such or such Opinions, and will give no account to other Churches which shall desire a reason of our Opinions, and practise, and so give an account, as either to prove out what we doe by arguments drawne from the Word, or else submit to the judgement of other Churches, our practises and opinions being confuted by the Word; or if the case be more dark, and cannot so quickly be determined, then to walke with such tenderneſſe, and due reſpect to other Churches, as it may appeare to be only pure conſcience that is the ground of any different practise, cleaving close in the meane time to those other Churches in all other points where we agree, against Errours, Sects, &c. such Independency as deny this, I conceive it to be an invention of a white Devill, to make a religious bridge over to all errours in opinion and practise.*

Hence [*having divers such persons in my Parish as the question mentions, who when they come to me to have their children Baptized, all the argument they give me is,* other Ministers doe baptize all; *and therein I practise differently from other Ministers, whom I esteeme farre before me in holineſſe, learning, and gifts*] *I thought I was bound to give an account to other Ministers, what are the grounds of my practise, in refusing such for the present; that I might thereby get answer to my scruples, and stirre up more able men, who practise as I doe, to undertake the controverſie; that so when I have seene the question fairely, and lovingly discussed, I may either practise as they doe, if I see all is taken off that can be said; or otherwise may not have ill thoughts conceived against me for this different practise.*

I have not in my Question set up a man of Straw, and

shoote

shoote at him my selfe, as if there were no such persons amongst us; there are many Families of which it may be truly said, They are families that call not on thy name; *some goe to their meate like Swine, for ignorance in my Parish; I am not willing to print what I have found* [*and yet meanes they have had before I came, lively and quicke*] *but the ignorance is such of some, and also in other Parishes, that if I should print what answers I have had from some, and others also have found in their Parishes, when they brought their children to be baptized, and this in* Essex, *not in* Cumberland *and them parts; the Reader would scarce beleeve it were possible to be true. Some to whom I related things by word of mouth, could not have beleeved the things, only they had that charitable opinion of me, that I would not lye. Search, O Ministers especially, in your Country Parishes, and you will finde ignorance enough I feare; it made me call to minde that famous story which blessed* Pemble *relates in his Sermon of,* the mischiefe of Ignorance, *concerning a man of sixty yeares of age;* Who had heard in his life time between two and three thousand Sermons, and lived civilly, who being questioned on his Death-bed what he thought of God, answered, He thought he was a good old man; And what of Christ? That he was a towardly young youth; And of his Soule? It was a great bone in his body; And what should become of his Soule after he was dead? That if he had done well he should have been put into a pleasant greene Meddow. *This man is not alone saith Mr.* Pemble.

As for prophaneneſſe, and scoffing at godlineſſe, I wish we had not too much proofe of it.

For non-submission to Discipline; I know such as cannot deny but that Church Discipline is an Ordinance of God, the light of Mat. 18. 15, 16, *&c. doth convince them; they*

have also acknowledged, that if they did not promise me to subject to Discipline, I had no power over them, and yet they would not subject to Discipline; Shall men come and picke what Ordinances they list, and walke as they list, and I shall have no power over them, to help to re-gaine them?

Concerning this one word, I know many Ministers scorne that Notion, that an explicite Covenant is the Forme of a particular visible Church; some Professors are so rigid for the explicitenesse of the Covenant, as without it they deny all Churches, and will not joyne in a Sacrament with them: These, if we tell them Mr. Hooker, *and the Elders of* New England *dare not put the formality of a Church in the explicitenesse of the Covenant, they make very light of them men, [Ignorance and Pride meete together] then I have bid such, give me one good Argument to prove it; but though they could make so light of such Worthies, all the wit they had could not produce one Scripture, or one Argument. I never met with the like pride and ignorance in Professors, and yet thinke themselves able to teach others, and scorne the Blackecoates.*

But if our Divines cast off a Covenant, or mutuall Engagement, [call it what you will] to walke with God, and one with another, &c. from being the Forme of a Church, let the Covenant be explicite, or implicite, I would gladly see what they make the Form; I have read something, and heard something concerning it, but for ought I can see, they are either such things as follow a Church, constituted in its essentiall causes, and so cannot be the Forme; *or they doe not doe that which a Forme must, i. e.* Distinguere Ecclesiam ab Ecclesia.

But this I will affirme, though explicitenesse be not essentiall to the Esse formale *of a Church, yet you will finde it almost required to the* esse *of the Government of the Church:*

for

for though I grant, there is an implicite consent to Church-*Government in that implicite* Covenant *which is in every Parochiall* Congregation, *yet when you come to exercise Discipline, you will finde some Members* explicitely stubborne, stiffe, *and then this implicite consent, they will spurne at their heeles.*

I know it by good experience, when a Church *member hath fallen, if I had only the implicite consent of being under Discipline, my selfe, and the rest of the Brethren, when we went privately first to bring such a one to a sight of his sinne, &c. we might have returned as wise as we went; but having this hold upon the person, by his* Covenant *to be subject to that rule,* Mat. 18, &c. *we could not leave him, being engaged to him, [else we would have done it, through that too much stiffenesse we found in the person] nor could he fly off from us, untill (God blessing our endeavours) we obtained our end.*

Apollonius, *who writeth against Independents, and a* Church Covenant, *yet in his first* chap. *where he sheweth what qualifications they require in Members, saith this is one;* Ut Disciplinæ se se subjiciant, *in his second Chap. concerning the Church Covenant, he saith thus;* Concedimus, fœdus aliquod tacitum seu virtuale esse inter membra unius & ejusdem particularis ecclesiæ externæ; quo obligantur ad mutua illa officia præstanda, quæ a membris ecclesiæ visibilis ad particularem suam ecclesiasticam communionem exiguntur, &c. *and for the explicitenesse of the Covenant, he saith, it is not unlawfull; but it seemes they must explicitely promise to be subject to Discipline, I think what he saith will very well content Congregationall men.* Pag. 4.

If Discipline be an Ordinance, then the constitution of a Church must be such, as that Ordinance may regularly be executed, or else here is an Ordinance, but no way to execute it. But how can this be executed without a free consent unto it,

being this Church relation is not naturall [*as Father and childe*] *but free?*

*What learned Mr.*Hooker, *and Mr.*Norton *hath said, to prove this to be the Form, I suppose, is not lightly esteemed by learned men.*

Now though I differ from other Ministers in this practise, yet I hope our difference is not so great, because it is onely in the extent of the Ordinance; as for Infant-Baptisme, *there, I fully accord with them. And further I will say*

First *I do it not out of any affectation to be thought more holy then others; I have such a heart within, that I loathe such a thought.*

Secondly, *Neither do I esteem other Ministers the lesse, or censure them for baptizing more largely then I do.*

Thirdly, *I can truely say, It hath been and is a matter of shame to me, to think I should differ from other Ministers so Holy and Learned, considering my owne vilenesse and weaknesse.*

Fourthly, *Neither dare I say it is pure Conscience that makes me thus practise, for to have a pure tender conscience indeed, I look on it as such an excellent thing, that I consent to Mr.* Rutherford *saying,* he that challengeth it, doth challenge the flower and garland of all godlinesse.

Lib. Cons. p. 19

Fiftly, *This I promise, that if I cannot find that which shall clearly answer me, and so may differ a little in this practise from other godly Ministers, yet in other points, against* Anabaptists, Antinomians, Anti-Sabbatarians, Non Singers of Psalmes, Arminians, Socinians, *with the rout of these new upstart Preachers, I shall cleave as close to them as I can. For these latter, although the Errors wherewith all of them* [*I think I may say*] *are tainted, be argument sufficient against them, yet I would adde one word more.*

The

The affirmative part of the second Commandement is, that the ordinances, or means of instituted worship be kept pure according to the institution; Now as Christ hath appointed Ordinances, so he hath appointed Officers orderly to dispense these, and hath set them down what Officers he will have in his Church, the rules also how these Officers must be qualified and set apart to these Offices. These Officers then are reduced to this second Commandement by able Divines, and since they must be reduced to some Commandement [*for it is not in our power to set up what Officers wee list*] *then certainly they belong to that Commandement: In setting up Officers then, men must hold to the Institution the Commandement bindes us, now the rule tels us besides their personall qualities, for ministeriall qualities, they must be* 2 Tim. 2. 2. *able men, able to teach their hearers, able to oppose gaine-sayers,* Tit. 1. 9. *The election by the people that is granted,* [*though much might here be said, what need the people have of the assistance of the neighbour Ministers to judge of the abilities of the Minister whom they choose.*] *Then the ordination of this person, which whether it be in the power of the Fraternity to give it formally, I would gladly see more then I have done as yet, but whersoever the power is, Ordination must be,* Heb: 6. 2. *it is one of the heads of the Catechism. Many expound that* laying on of hands, *to be of Confirmation; but besides the judgement of* Pareus, *Mr.* Johnson *the Separate, Mr.* Hooker *of* New England, Dickson Gillespie, &c. *all which expound it of Ordination, good reasons may be given why it must be so interpreted, and not of Confirmation.*

Amef. med. th: l. 2. c. 13. th. 17.

Amesius med. th: l. c. 39. th. 31.

Thus then to observe these Rules is to walk according to the Commandement, but else, to omit these, is to crosse the mind of the Commandement. Do these upstart Preachers answer these Rules? I wonder at the boldnesse of men, who think that the worke of a Minister is only to speak a few honest things, and

hence they having heard much, and having English *Bookes by them [scorning the learned men who were the Authors of them] and a bold face with them, thinke it enough to furnish them for a Pulpit: I doe not desire to Idolize learning so much as to have the soules of people starved for want of learned Preachers: But if there were men found out, well gifted, godly, sound in the Truth, separated to the worke, with some able learned Divines to goe along with them into those darke corners, let them goe; and the will of God be done: But if learning had received so much encouragement as it might, [though not to make Ministers Arch-Bishops] we need not have gone to the* London *Apprentices for Ministers, we might have had able young Schollars to have filled the Churches of* England, *without this erronious Generation, that now sow their seed whersoever they doe come.*

I am confident the ablest Minister in England *findeth so much in the study of Divinity, that if his life were to be as long againe as it is, he should finde enough to fill his head and heart, and yet say, I come short.* Rob. Purnell *labours much about that text,* 2 Pet. 3. 16. *in his Epistle to the Presbyterians, the which Epistle the more I read it, and observe his language to them, being many of them very holy, gracious, able learned men, the more my Spirit rises against him, the Spirit of Christ would have taught him more manners towards such equals (if they be his equals) it may be they are his superiours in age and place; I know nothing of the man but by his Booke, which I wonder any savoury Christian should delight in, but I shall say this only to him; Let all Christians which are not learned, blesse the Lord for learned ones, the learned and godly Black-coats; Doe not discover your folly in asking, Why so? 2. I say this, many a man with the common gifts of the* Spirit, *shall by the help of Arts and Tongues finde out the meaning of* Pauls *Epistles, and other parts of the*

word,

word, when a Christian who hath found grace, but wanting learning, shall be able to give no interpretation, or a false one, as I have heard eminent Saints doe, yea in plaine Scriptures.

3. *I would answer him in the words of blessed* Burroughs, I dare avow this, that never since the beginning of the world, could a man be found to speake against Learning, but an ignorant man; neither is it like, nay I may aver, it is impossible that any but such wil be found to the end of the world: Learning hath so much of God in it, that it never had, nor will have any enemy but ignorance. Iren. p. 88, 89.

Let me but trouble the Reader with one thing more, and then I shall proceed. Some possibly take advantage from New England, *where at the first the Fraternity did ordaine their Officers* [*since I came away I heare the Ministers of other Churches have ordained Elders in their neighbour Churches*] *but that doth not help our wilde practises here, for* (*omitting other things*) *when ever there was any Church to be gathered in a new Plantation, there was notice first given to the Country, the civill Magistrate, and the Ministers, with Messengers from other Churches were there present, to heare those persons relate their work of grace, and also their confession of faith, that be sure they were sound in the faith, else the Civill Power would soone have taken a course with them. The Minister they chose, especially if a young man, before he came to the day of Ordination, preached at some Lecture where the Elders met and heard him, and thus all was carried on with the presence of these Persons: but what is this to your gathering of Churches here, when a company of Anabaptists* (*or others*) *shall meete together in a chamber, and chuse one out from them, and ordain him for a Pastor* (*forsooth*) *as in a Towne by us, they have made a Hop-merchant their Pastor, a fellow all the week long up to the eares in the world, and when the Sabbath comes, he preaches*

(*they*

(they say) and gives that which they call the Lords Supper, to his company.

If any shall object against me, my preaching so long without Ordination, I answer: 1. *I never contemned the Ordinance.* 2. *I would never have come into a Pulpit, if I had not intended to have been Ordained.* 3. *I did endeavour to have some Ministers to Ordaine me, two yeares before I could obtaine it, because of troubles.* 4. *The reason why I did delay it, was, because I would have it in the place where I was chosen, and not in another place from my people, which I apprehended not to be so regular.*

The blessed Prophet of his Church, Teach us; the same blessed King, lead us, not *unto*, but *into* all his Truths, Theoreticall, Practicall: *Fortiter, suaviter.*

So prayes the unworthiest of all Christs Ministers:

G. F.

PROPERTY OF
ANGLICAN
THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

A ſerious Queſtion ſtated:

VIZ.

Whether the Miniſters of England *are bound by the Word of God, to Baptize the Children of all ſuch Parents, which ſay, they beleeve in Jeſus Chriſt; but are groſly ignorant, ſcandalous in their converſations, ſcoffers at godlineſſe, and refuſe to ſubmit to Church-Diſcipline?*

TWo things I muſt premiſe, which will give occaſion to move two Queſtions, which tend much to the clearing of the queſtion in hand:

1 The firſt thing I premiſe is this; The Infant that is to be Baptized, if we conſider it in it ſelfe as abſtracted from the Parent, gives no reaſon for it ſelfe why it ſhould be Baptized; I baptize not this Childe rather then that, by vertue of any Argument drawne from the childe; conſidered as it is in its ſelfe without relation to the Parent, this appeares preſently; for ſuppoſe in a Pariſh there ſhould live Chriſtians, Indians, Turkes, and all had Children, and one ſhould bring a childe to the Miniſter to Baptize it, and he knew not whoſe it was, I ſuppoſe he would aske the queſtion whoſe is it? for it might be a Turkes, or Indians childe, as well as a Chriſtians, now what need he aske the queſtion, Whoſe is it? it is *Homo*, whoſe ſoever it is, Baptize it; no ſure, no Miniſter would doe thus.

2 All children then are Baptized by vertue of the Parent, one or both; ever conſidering the childe in relation to the Parent, being the branch of ſuch a root, and ſo I take in the childe together with the Parent. Hence we ſay commonly, they muſt be children borne in the Church; that is, of ſuch Parents as are members of the Church, being a ſociety of viſible Saints, joyned together by way of Covenant, to exerciſe an holy communion with God in Chriſt, and ſo one with another according to the order of the Goſpel, for I preſume none are ſo ſottiſh to underſtand a Church to be that place, which (by a metonymie of the ſubject) we call a Church, nor the Pariſhes men live in, which never were of an Eccleſiaſticall conſtitution.

Upon this ground ſtand all our arguments againſt the Anabaptiſts, and if this be taken away, Infant-baptiſme muſt fall.

There is indeed one argument uſed by our Divines, *Ameſius*, and others with him, but it is not an argument drawne from what the childe doth give, but what it can receive. This it is; in the working of *that* inward *grace*, of *which Baptiſm* is *the ſigne and ſeale*, all who *partake* of that *grace*, are *but meere* Patients, *and contribute no more then a Childe*, ergo, *it may be baptized*. But here if we conſider the childe with this argument, without reſpect to the Parent; ſee how the argument will run.

All that are Subjects capable of that grace to which Baptiſme is a ſigne and ſeale, they may be baptized.

But the children of Turkes, and Indians, are Subjects capable of that grace, to which Baptiſme is a ſigne and ſeale; *Ergo* their Children may be baptized.

Hence then that argument which is ſo often (but indiſcreetly) uſed; what though the Parents be never ſo wicked, what doe you know what the childe may prove; many a wicked man may have good children, they may be elect; *Et contra*, this I ſay proves an argument of no ſtrength; for election is no rule for me to goe by, I will ſay the ſame of the Indians children, eſpecially now in *New England*, what do you know but that this or that Childe may be Elect, prove godly, though the Father be an Indian. A ſuppoſition *De futuro*, is no rule for me to give the ſeale of the Covenant at this preſent,

ſent, but I muſt look at the Childe as a Covenanter, but that is in the Parent.

This rule warrants any Miniſter comfortably to adminiſter that Ordinance; here is a Parent, (one or both) viſibly in Covenant with God, and a viſible member of Chriſts Church, I doe therefore adminiſter the ſeale of the Covenant unto this childe by vertue of this Parent, according to that command given to *Abraham*, the Father of Beleevers, with whom when the Lord entred into Covenant, and layed the foundation of the Church viſible in his Family, he took his Seed into Covenant with him, and commanded that they with him ſhould keep that ſeale of his Covenant. Now as the ſecond Commandement bindes us, that whatever Worſhip, or Ordinances God ſhall ſet up, whether thoſe under the Old Teſtament, or theſe under the New Teſtament, yet be ſure they be kept pure; the morality of the command is the ſame, though the forme of Worſhip is changed: So the morality (as I may ſay) of that command ſtands thus; that let God appoint that Seale of Circumciſion to be the initiating Seale under the Old Teſtament, or this of Baptiſme under the New Teſtament, yet the children of viſible Beleevers muſt have the initiating Seale. This I doe beleeve upon many grounds moving me to it, and ſhall doe ſo, till the Anabaptiſts can bring me *expreſſe Scriptures* out of the New Teſtament, where God hath caſt off the children of beleeving Parents, whom under the Old Teſtament he tooke into Covenant with their Parents; The Anabaptiſts will buy, by the meaſure of expreſſe Scriptures, let them ſell, by the ſame meaſure.

Queſt. *But here now comes in a Queſtion; What Parent doe you meane, the immediate Parent only, or the Predeceſſors? for ſuppoſe the immediate Parent be as your queſtion mentions, yet it may be the Grand-father, or ſome of the Predeceſſors have been godly, doth not that promiſe,* Exod. 20. 6. *warrant the baptizing by vertue of them?*

Anſ. I perceive divers of our Divines help themſelves here, and ſome in diſcourſe are content to looſe that ground of the immediate Parent, and fly to this; men whom I dare not thinke ſlightly of, but doe reverence their holineſſe, and honour their Learning in my heart.

Yet with ſubmiſſion to theſe men, I ſhall deſire to propound ſome few ſcruples that trouble me.

And firſt, It would not be amiſſe to caſt our eyes back to our Predeceſſors, and ſee how this *Engliſh* Nation came to be a Church, and the Perſons made Beleevers; the Story is wel knowne, and therefore I doe but touch it. It cannot be denied but that *England* was one of them Iſles, *Iſa.* 42. 4. which ſoone received the Law of Chriſt, that there were reall Chriſtians among them Chriſtians, who dare ſay the contrary, when ſo many thouſands of them ſuffered under that bloudy Tyrant (*Dioclefian*) for the Name of Chriſt; this Tyrant though he made woſull havock in the Church, yet it doth not appeare by Story that he did quite deſtroy all the Chriſtians, but there was a remnant left, which continued even when the *Saxons* over-run the Nation.

When *Auſtin* came into *England*, the Waters began to be brackiſh at *Rome*; neither Worſhip (eſpecially) nor Doctrine ſo pure as before; after he had converted King *Ethelbert* to the profeſſion of the Faith in Chriſt, many alſo received the ſame Faith; none being compelled by the King, ſaith the Story [which yet is no ground for Toleration in our times] and thus *England* in a ſhort time received the Faith; But whether all did it by the Word enlightning, convincing, &c. and not rather as people follow Court faſhions, ſo the Court religion, King *Ethelbert* is become a Chriſtian, and Baptized, ſo will we, and ſo upon Tradition others that ſucceeded tooke up Chriſtianity, it is much to be doubted; for wee know in what ſtate the Churches were when *Auſtin* came from *Rome*, and dark night of Popery followed preſently; ſo that I doe not reckon them Chriſtians brought to the faith by *Auſtin*, to be like them who before were ſlaine: Thus we held the name of Chriſtianity under the *Romiſh* yoke, till of late times the State threw it off, and then the people following the State [as they will doe, ſaith Maſter *Rogers* the Proto-Martyr in Queen *Maries* dayes, if the State change ten times in one yeare, the people would ever be ready at hand to change with it] they threw off that yoke alſo, and ſo *England* is become Proteſtant. I doubt not but God had his number in thoſe darke Times, but what were thoſe few in com-

comparison of the body of the people, our Predecessors. Since the time of the Gospel restored to its purity, God hath wonderfully appeared in *England*; but those who use the argument of Predecessors run very high; now I will a little consider the text in reference to them.

1. *Mercy unto thousands*, of whom? *of them who love me, and keepe, &c.* This then is cleare, that this promise is made to such as are *really godly*, and no children can claime this promise, but the children of such Parents as did love God, and keep his Commandements, and this Commandement of the purity of his Worship in a speciall manner, as some of our Divines doe interpret it. I hope formall Professors, such as have no truth of Grace in them, will not be judged such persons as God mentioned in his Promise, to be lovers of him, and keepers of his Worship in purity; for the latter, our Predecessors in those darke times of Popery, they did not keep that Commandement purely. Such then as bring this Promise to prove their right to their childrens Baptisme, must bring this proofe, That their Predecessors were really such as the Promise is made to; this will helpe me a little in refusing to Baptize many children, for there are divers who as their immediate Parents are wicked, so we cannot learne that their Grand-father, or great Grand-father, or Grand-mother, &c. were so much as esteemed godly.

Shepheard. moral. Sab. p. 1. Thes. 61. and others.

Obj. *But though you, nor others know of any, yet in charity you must judge they had some were godly?*

Ans. I love charity as much as another, but I would have it have eyes; Justice indeed we use to picture blinde-folded, that it might give to every one that which is *suum*, and not be perverted by the sight of mens persons, &c. but to have charity thus blind-folded in the Administration of the Ordinances of Christ, is not safe.

Besides, this will prove a troublesome rule, for I can easier judge of a visible Saint, whom I know and live by, then judge of the reality of a mans godlinesse, especially when they are dead, or I know him not.

2. Againe, That threat of Gods *visiting iniquity*, &c. I hope you will limit it to such children as are followers of their Fathers wicked steps, not of others; *Jerobeam*, *Jehu*, and their

their posterity finde it true; but good *Hezekiah* not following wicked *Abaz*, it doth not reach him; Why then is not this promise to be limited as well to such as follow their Parents steps, but if the Sonne be a scorner, an opposer of God, and his Commandements, must he needs challenge this mercy of Baptisme for his Childe, and the Minister bound to give it him? doth not God rather fulfill the threat, in visiting his iniquity upon his childe, thus to debarre it of this Ordinance?

3 Againe, I am not satisfied how that can be a setled rule for us to administer Baptisme by, wherein we see the Lord taking his liberty. Doth God ever visite the iniquity, as the threat runs? Doth he ever shew mercy to all the Posterity, &c? *Zanchy* saith of the threat; *Quamvis non semper habeat locum, non propterea tamen efficitur, quin verissima sit, & quam sæpissimè suam habeat efficacitatem.* So he saith of the Promise, he gives a caution there also. So Mr. *Perkins*, *We may not surmise that this excellent Promise is made to every one particularly, who is borne of faithfull Parents.* If then God will reserve a liberty of bestowing temporall mercies, and eternall mercies to the posterity of good and bad, why must God be tied up by this promise, that he may not deny the posterity of a wicked Parent, [who had godly Parents] the seale of the Covenant; why must he have no liberty in this mercy as well as in them?

In 2. in Pryn.

Obj. *But we see among the Jewes, wicked Parents had their children Circumcised?*

Ans. But was it by vertue of this Promise that God had tyed up himselfe so, or from some other ground? for the objection it selfe I shall consider it in another place.

4 If the godly Predecessors by vertue of this Promise doe give a right to Baptisme, though the immediate wicked Parent doth not; then suppose a childe whose immediate Parent is very godly, and baptized by vertue of him, growing up, proves very scandalous, yet I hope the Promise made to his immediate Parent, will give him right to the Lords Supper, though otherwise he must be debarred; *for mercy to thousands, &c.* the Lords Supper is a mercy as well as Baptisme.

Obj.

Obj. *No, the person himselfe doth* obicem ponere

Ans. If the wickednesse of this childe growne up, doth put a barre betweene the immediate godly Parent and the Lords Supper, why doth not the scandalous vile conversation of the immediate Parent, put in a barre betweene his Predecessors, and the childe to be baptized?

Obj. *The childe must not suffer for the Parents sinne?* Ezek. 18.

Ans. 1. True, for eternall death, if not guilty it selfe.

2 These children which complaine, and therefore were *adulti*, had not they walked in their steps, should not have met with those punishments; but the sowre Grapes were found in their mouthes also. But for their Infants, how many suffered with the Parents.

3 It is true, the childe shall not suffer for the Parent in such things wherein the childe may be considered absolutely without relation to, or dependance upon the Parent, as it may in things temporall, eternall; but if the childe cannot so be considered, but alwaies in relation to the Parent, as giving the right [as in this case] it may suffer by him, and it will appeare so after.

4 If the childe walk not in the Parents steps; now though the childe cannot be said actually to follow the Parents steps, yet the childe is reputed, and relatively is esteemed as the Parent, holy with him, or unholy with him; an Infidels childe is an Infidell, though actually it doth not follow its fathers steps.

5 That text, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *The unbeleeving Wife is sanctified by the beleeving Husband, else were your Children uncleane; but now are they holy.* This text seemes to tye the federall holinesse of the childe to the immediate Parent, doth not say, the childe is holy by vertue of a great Grandfather.

Let us suppose in the Church of *Corinth* some persons who may be sixty yeares of age, this Husband and Wife thus old have children, but they are Infidels, they will not owne Christ, nor his holy Government, &c. now these Infidels have children borne, so that the old man of sixty yeares, is a Grand-father to this young infant of his Sonne an Infidell; would now a Minister take this infant though the father be

an

an Infidell, and baptize it by vertue of the Grand-father? I ſuppoſe it would trouble a Conſciencious Miniſter. The Grand-father is old, may dye quickly before the childe grow up, the Infidell his Father breeds him up in his Idolatry; let the Church take it ſay you, but the Infidell will not, he ſcornes the Church, and their religion. So ſuppoſe the Infidell will not let his Father take his childe to baptize it, what will you doe, who have moſt right over the childe, the Father, or Grand-father? You muſt alſo ſuppoſe the Grand-father and the childe to dwell together, that he may bring it up, and Catechize it, &c. this is ſtrange to force this, which we may ſuppoſe many things to hinder. I cannot ſee how they be proper ſubjects to convey the right of Baptiſme to another, who may have juſt hinderances in the conveyance of it; *Aquinus* ſaith, *Filii infidelium, cum ante uſum liberi arbitrii ſub parentum cura ſunt, non ſunt eo tempore invitis parentibus Baptizandi.* So Greg. de val. *Ut rectè Baptizentur parvuli filii infidelium, requiritur conſenſus parentum in quorum poteſtate ſunt, ita ut his invitis, quamdiu quidem in ipſorum poteſtate & cura ſunt parvuli minime liceat ipſos Baptizare.* He gives the reaſon, *Jure naturæ ſunt parvuli ſub cura & poteſtate parentum; ergo fieret parentibus injuria, ſi ipſis invitis baptizarentur, &c.*

Pag 3. q. 68. a. 10.

To. 4. Diſ. 4. q. 3. p. 3.

The immediate Parent, let all the Predeceſſors be Infidels, it hinders not him in his conveyance, &c. *Ergo* he is the perſon to whom the right of conveying the Seale doth belong, and not he that even in *foro Eccleſiæ* have hinderances in the conveyance; the Church muſt not act againſt the Law of Nature.

6 If that promiſe doth give this power to Predeceſſors, &c. then though there are none to educate this childe [for the ignorant, prophane Parents will not, but teach them how to breake the Covenant; the Predeceſſors cannot, they are dead, and are not] yet we muſt ſeale to this childe, &c. Where doe you ſee Churches take care of ſuch children, they muſt be of ſome bigneſſe and underſtanding before the Church meddle with them, the immediate prophane perſon brings him up in ignorance and prophaneneſſe; neither will take care to have his childe inſtructed by the Church; as experience witneſſe too much.

7 If the Predeceſſor may by this promiſe give right to Bap-

Baptisme without the immediate Parent, then I pray tell us, how farre we may goe for this Predecessor? how many Generations? Where hath Gods Word limited Ministers, you may goe to this Predecessor, and no farther? I know of no text that limits but this, and this will allow us to goe to the thousand Generation to finde a Predecessor; if so we should, strange things would follow.

8 If by vertue of that promise, Predecessors may without the immediate parent give right to Baptisme, then the children of an immediate Parent Apostatized from the Faith, and excommunicated from the Church, may be baptized.

But the Consequent is false, *ergo* the Antecedent.

The consequence is plaine, for the Predecessors give right without the immediate Parent, then let him be what he will, yet his children may be Baptized by vertue of them; and if so, then the children of our *English-men* now in *Turkey*, who are apostatized from their Faith to that religion, may be baptized, and so many of those who are the posterity of the seven Churches of *Asia*, and it is to be feared are turned to that religion may by vertue of their Predecessors be baptized. See *Gerbard* moving this question; Whether the children of such Hereticks as professe they will bring up their children in their Heresie ought to be baptized? He concludes for the negative: His first Argument is; *Pari passu ambulant, cum Infantibus infidelium, cum parentes ipsorum itidem sint extra Ecclesiam, à qua nefarium facere divortium.* He adds more Arguments, and answers Objections: but if that be a good argument in *Gerhards* account, I hope it will be as good for me, in the next branch of my Argument, and doth also help to this first branch; I hope an Apostate from the Faith (such a one as now I speake of) is as bad as an Heretick, yet it may be this Hereticks father might be Orthodox.

For the Excommunicate person; If I may baptize the children of an excommunicate Parent, then I may baptize the children of one who is no member of a Church [for so is the excommunicate person] so consequently the children of a *Turke*, or *Indian*, for they are no Members of a Church, and the excommunicate person is no other in respect of his communion in Church priviledges.

If you give me leave to baptize persons out of the pale (as they say) of the Church, I may then goe any whither; but this person is without the pale.

Baptisme notes communion with the Church, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13 how then is he excommunicated if his childe be baptized?

If this Parent were a Heathen, and not a Member of the Church, should his children be baptized? why then since by his excommunication he is made as a Heathen, and in some respect below a Heathen [for with a Heathen I may eate, 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. but with him I must not eate, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11.] should his children be baptized?

If you say, there is difference between him and a *Heathen*, for he still holds his profession of Faith, and may belong to God, &c. I deny not this, but as to Church Communion, and Church Priviledges, I know not but we may admit a Heathen to them as wel as he, and so it was in *New England*, the Indians did enjoy as much as an excommunicated person.

If the childe be a member of the Church with the parent, and reputed so only by vertue of the parent, then if the parent be a Non-member, the childe also is a non-member. I presume none will deny this; and then to baptize such a childe, is to baptize a non-member.

To prove it by this text, is *petitio principii*. I suppose both parents excommunicated, or, but one a member, for if the Mother continues a member of the Church, the excommunicated Father hinders not.

It is worth the consideration, what learned *Gillespie* ob-
Aar. rod. p. 58. serves out of *Buxtorf*. He tells us, that this difference was put between him that was guilty of cutting off, and of him that was guilty of death. *Reus mortis, ipse tantum, non semen ejus; pœna excidii comprehendit ipsum & semen ejus.* Now if the punishment of death was personall only, and the punishment of cutting off, comprehensive not only of them but of their Seed, how can this agree so well to any thing else, as to excommunication, especially if that hold which *Goodwin* in his *Moses* and *Aaron*, *Lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. tells us, that the children of excommunicated persons were not circumcised. Thus Master *Gillespie*.

Chemnitius also seemes to me to be of this Opinion, upon them

them words, *Mat.* 18. 17. Let him be to thee as an Heathen: *Hoc est, excommunicetur; non admittatur ad absolutionem, non ad Communionem Sacramentorum, sive Baptismi sive Cœnæ dominicæ, &c.* Now how shall we interpret this his non-admission to Baptisme but in his children; this person was baptized before, for he must be a Brother (saith he) that is to be excommunicated. What, would not he have the person re-baptized? The *Lutherans* were against re baptizing, as appeares by *Gerhard, Loc. Com. To.* 4. *de bapt. cap.* 8.

Zanchy I know is against me, and quotes *Augustin* against it also, he names not the Epistle, but I suppose he meanes his 75. Epistle, *Ad Auxilium*: His argument is, *Anima quæ peccaverit, ipsa morietur*; but so had not the sonne of *Classicianus*, he was not guilty of his sinne. We say with *Augustin*, That soule indeed shall dye, the childe shall not be damned for the Father, but to this I have answered before, only this I adde; "Those that know *Austines* opinion concerning Infants dying unbaptized, will not wonder though he were for the "baptizing of the children of excommunicated parents; but I "suppose our Divines are not of his judgement in that point.

I have there mentioned Mr. *Perkins*, I saw him just as it had done, but now I send the answer thus:

Holy and learned *Perkins* I finde also to be against me. I shall briefly run over what he saith. Cas. Cons. ch. 9. q. 3

First, he saith, *Children of Parents that are professed Members of the Church (though cut off for a time, upon some offence committed) have right to Baptisme, because it is not in the power of man to cut them off from Christ, though they be excommunicated.*

Ans. 1. This hath little in it, who say, They are absolutely cut off from Christ (or can be, if once in him?) let secret things goe, though he be not so, yet from Church Communion I hope he is cut off; he hath nothing to doe with Church Priviledges.

2 Upon this ground I would give him the Lords Supper still, for he is not cut off from Christ, though excommunicated.

3 Visibly he appeares, and is reckoned as no member of Christ. *Statu quo* [*Cut off for a time*] he saith; but who knows how long?

Secondly, *The personall sinne of the Parent may not keepe the blessing from the Childe, &c.* Ergo.

Ans. This I have answered before; I say now, though *Personall sinne* may not deprive it, yet the *Personall state* of the Parent may deprive the childe; for the childe is reputed as the parent in respect of Church-membership, the childe is wholly dependent on the parent in this point.

Thirdly, *We must alway put a difference between them which doe not make separation from the Church, and yet are grievous offenders; and open Apostataes, that joyne themselves with the enemies of the Church, &c.*

Ans. 1. His first part doth not amount to the question in hand, for one may be a grievous offender, and not separate from the Church, and yet not excommunicated.

2. Though he hath not separated from the Church, yet the Church hath separated him, and Christ hath ratified the sentence.

3. He should have proved, we must put such a difference, as to baptize the childe of the one, and not the other. We cannot say, as (excellently) *Bradwardin*; *Nonne cuilibet Christiano, imo & prophano. pro Demonstratione sufficere debet, Deus dicit*; so it is sufficient demonstration, *Perkinsius dicit*; yet I thinke I honour him as much as any man living.

De caus. Dei, l. 1. p. 29.

4 Suppose, that Apostata be not excommunicated by the Church, and should now require Baptisme for his childe, what will you doe?

Fourthly, He saith; *We must put a difference between such excommunicated Persons, and Infidels.*

Ans. He is to be reputed as a Heathen in Church account, *Mat.* 18. 17. The question still is, whether such a difference, as I said in answer to the former objection.

Fifthly, he saith; *The mercy of God enlargeth it selfe to thousands, &c.*

Ans. It is true in some sence, but to bring that place to prove the question in hand, is *Petitio principii.*

9 I pray prove it to me, that the children of such Jewes who were wicked [which is the strongest Argument I meete with] had their children circumcised, only with reference to the predecessors, and not the immediate parent, who was of *Abrahams* seed according to the flesh, not excommunicated.

ted, and doubtleſſe ſo long the immediate parent was not caſt off from giving a right to his childe.

If then that promiſe will prove this opinion of the predeceſſors giving right to the childe without the immediate parent, yet it muſt be ſuppoſed that the immediate parent is not Apoſtatized from the Faith, nor excommunicate; for I obſerve ſome made doubt of it then, who are for this opinion; and what is this but to ſay, a man muſt be a viſible beleever, and a member of the Church, and then why not by vertue of the immediate parent?

Only this gives occaſion to move another queſtion, which helps to cleare our way.

Queſt. Whether is this bare profeſſion of faith in Chriſt, [though Parents be groſly ignorant, ſcandalous, and refuſe to ſubject to Church Diſcipline] ſufficient to make a man, and continue him a member of the viſible Church?

Anſ. Thoſe Divines who baptize all children I ſuppoſe doe it upon this ground, *England* hath received the Faith, and ſo all our *Engliſh* people are beleevers; they looke on them all as Church members, and therefore baptize all.

This I confeſſe is ſome diſadvantage to me, for if a man be looked upon as a viſible Saint, and reputed a member of a true Church, if that member be very ſcandalous, and the Church let him alone, and not deale with him, that perſon may challenge any Ordinance in the Church, both Baptiſm, and Lords Supper. But I conceive ſuch a perſon is not ſufficiently qualified to make a member of a Church, nor ought to be continued a member of the Church; but the Church ought to ſeeke to reforme him, or if not, to caſt him out; ſo that if the Church will let ſuch a perſon alone, and give him theſe Ordinances, there will be guilt charged upon that Church.

That ſuch a one is not fit to be a Member, I prove.

1 Members of Churches according to the Goſpell, are Saints viſible;

But ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions, is not a viſible Saint: *Ergo.*

The major is plaine enough; The Saints at *Philippi*, Saints at *Rome*, Saints at *Corinth*, Saints in *Caſars* Houſhold, &c. this is common.

The minor; ſuch as will ſay that ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions is a viſible Saint, I thinke his eyes are not good. He that tells me, the Saints which *Paul* mentions in thoſe places, were no other then ſuch a perſon as is in the queſtion, he muſt pardon me though I beleeve him not.

2 If a bare profeſſion of faith in Chriſt, be ſufficient to make a member of a Church, then no perſon can juſtly be excommunicated out of a Church for the vileſt ſins, or hereſies, provided he doth but hold this profeſſion of his faith.

The conſequence is cleare; the perſon is the ſame now which he was when you tooke him into the Church; why then ſhould you caſt him out? The inceſtuous perſon did profeſſe his faith in Chriſt, when admitted, that was ſufficient, no more was required of him, why is he now caſt out? The ſtone is now, as it was when you layed it on to the building.

This were a wilde courſe, a man profeſſes he beleeves in Chriſt, and that is all; groſly ignorant, he lives in ſcandalous ſins, you know it, yet becauſe he ſaith he beleeves in Chriſt you admit him, and within a fortnight it may be you muſt goe about to caſt him out againe.

3 He that manifeſtly oppoſeth Chriſt in his viſible Kingdome, is not fit to be a member of a Church; but ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions, doth manifeſtly oppoſe Chriſt in his viſible kingdome: *Ergo.*

The major is plaine, for to be a member of a viſible Church is to be a ſubject of Chriſts viſible kingdome; that viſible politick Body, over whom he is as Head, and King, by politicall government, 1 *Cor.* 12.

But a manifeſt Oppoſer, a Rebell, is no Subject; thoſe who oppoſe him in his Lawes, and Diſcipline, ſurely oppoſe him in his viſible kingdome; ſuch as profeſſe they will not ſubmit their necks to his yoke.

Obj. *But all are not convinced that Church Diſcipline is an Ordinance of God?*

Anſ. But I ſpeake of ſuch as have been convinced, and acknowledged it from that text, in *Matth.* 18. 15. &c. but yet would not ſubmit to it.

I wonder not though the *Eraſtians* have laboured to daſh that Ordinance out of the Church; for we finde, to walke

cloſe

close according to Christs rule herein, as *Mat.* 18.15 &c. guides us, it will cost some crossing of the flesh; it is an excellent means to keep love among Christians, curb sin, beautifie a Church, ; we could easily yeeld it up to the Erastians, but because we find it crosse to our flesh, we know there is something of God in it.

Though *Erastus* was a good Phisitian, yet he wanted a little *Helebore* himselfe; Mr. *Gillespie hath prepared it for his followers.*

Many more Arguments might be given, but I spare them. Let us hear what others say.

Just. Martyr seems to intimate that more is required, then a bare profession of faith. For relating to the Emperour the manner how they did dedicate themselves to God; it was in this manner, ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ &c. I observe three things in it: First, *Such as were perswaded and did beleeve the things to be true which were taught.* Where we finde no civill power, no Court Religion to have had any place; it was the right way, *Go teach all Nations.* [*The things which they taught them*] it should seem then, it was more then barely to say, I beleeve in Christ, and many of our ignorant people know little else, neither do they understand that, so much as these did, καὶ βίον οὕτως ἀναδῦσαι ὑποχωῦνται. The second thing was a promise *to live according to those rules which had been taught.* Where (by the way) we may observe, a kind of Covenant made in them times in admissions, the *verb.* ὑποχωῦνται, from ὑποχνέομαι *policeor, promitto,* imply as much, they promised so to live, the verb ἀναδῦσι carries a little more in it, but take it in the easiest sence, εὔχεσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν, &c. διδάσκουσι. The third was, *they taught them, by prayer and fasting to seek the pardon of their former sins, they joyning also with them in the duty,* then they baptized them. This is more then a bare profession of faith. Apol 2. p. 63.

Apollonius [*de qualificatione membrorum ecclesiæ*] opposing first that ridged examination [in that I consent with him] sets down the qualifications of persons whom Ministers may admit into a visible Church, and thus he describes them. *Qui veram Christi religionem & fidem profitentur absque scandalo vitam traducunt, aut in scandala prolapsi resipiscentia illa abluunt in foro ecclesiæ Disciplinæ sese subjiciunt, omnia divini cultus exercitia publice fre-*

frequentant, & ecclesiasticam communionem nobiscum expetunt. Five things he requires; these are more then a bare sleight profession that I beleeve in Christ.

Medul. Th l. 1. c. 32 Th. 8. *Amesius*, Having given the definition of a Church, takes the essentiall Causes, matter, and forme asunder, and speaks to them severally, for the matter he said it was, *societas fidelium*, But then adds, *Quia autem vera fides conjunctam habet sanctitatem, quam efficacitèr operatur*, Act. 15. 9. *atqùe adeó professio verae fidei non potest dis-jungi à professione sanctitatis, idcirco promiscuè, & eodem sensu dicitur ecclesia societas fidelium, & societas sanctorum*, Eph. 1. 1. 1 Cor. 1. 2 *col. cum.* 2 Cor. 1. 1. &c.

So that a profession of holinesse must be, as well as a profession of faith.

Jus. Div. The *London* Ministers in their preface, where they make the paralell between the Independant and Presbyterian, say, the matter of a Church visible are, *Persons professing true faith in Christ, and obedience to him, according to the rules of the Gospell.* But shall then those who are grosly ignorant about Christ, and the Articles of Faith, and in their lives actually professe manifest disobedience against Christ, and refuse to subject to his Discipline, be esteemed fit matter of a Church?

p. 37. Afterwards when they give the notation of the Word, ἐκκλησία, three things they say are implyed, 1. *The terme from which* they are called. 2 *The terme to which* they are called. 3 the *Medium by which* they are brought from one term to another, viz. by *Calling*. If the *Integrum* be thus, then all the Members that are essentiall to that *Integrum*, must by calling be brought from one term to another. Therefore, after they adde, *A visible Church is, a company of those that are called to the*

Ibid. *visible Profession of the Faith in Christ, and Obedience unto Christ, according to the Gospell.* But are men called, when they doe not visibly answer the Call, but are quite opposite? They describe the matter of the Church visible, but [with honour to so Learned Men] here is something omitted which was expressed in the Notation, *Viz:* The *Terme from which* they are Called. Indeed, wee may gather by the *Terme to which* they are Called [which is expressed] what they meane, but I conceive it would have been more cleare, especially because some thinke onely a

Calling

Calling from Idols to be the *terminus à quo*; the queſtion in the old forme of baptizing ſeemes to expreſſe this *terme from* which: Doeſt thou forſake the Devill and all his Workes, the vaine Pomp, &c?

That which is not ſufficient to entitle a man to Baptiſme, is not ſufficient to make a man a member of a Church.

But the profeſſion of faith of ſuch a perſon as the queſtion mentions is not ſufficient to make him a Church Member: *Ergo.*

The major is granted of all, and muſt be eſpecially of thoſe who ſay, Baptiſme makes us members of a Church.

The minor I ſhall prove afterwards.

Obj. *This is true, if the Churches of* England *were now in their firſt conſtitution, but here have been a ſucceſſion of Churches for many yeares.*

Anſ. That which doth conſtitute a Church in its being, doth continue a Church in its being; if therefore a bare ſleight profeſſion be not enough at firſt to make a man a member of a Church, it is not enough to continue a man a member of a Church.

Let Churches then be conſtituted according to the rule, and let them be continued according to their firſt conſtitution, or elſe exerciſe Diſcipline, and reduce them to their firſt conſtitution. But this is the ſad condition which want of *faithfull Miniſters, Catechizing, and Diſcipline hath* brought our Churches to.

Succeſſion then anſwers nothing to continue ſuch members of a Church, unleſſe they be ſuch as ſhould be in the firſt conſtitution. We may as well anſwer this, as our Divines anſwer *Bellermin* his fifth note of a Church, *Succeſſio Apoſtolica*, but I will not trouble the Reader.

Our Churches then ſhew what need we have of Diſcipline, if Excommunication be too hard, being they are numerous, who are no other then the queſtion mentions; [not that I meane we ſhould preſently fall upon excommunication before we have tried other meanes, and patiently waited, this were a wilde courſe] then let us ſee if ſome other way may be found out to bring our Churches to ſome better reformation. I ſhall humbly preſent my thoughts at the end of the booke.

Having thus made way, I shall propound one Argument or two for the Negative, viz. That Ministers by the Gospell are not bound to baptize the children of such parents.

My first Argument I take from the practise of my reverend Fathers, and Brethren.

1 Such persons as (*De jure*) ought, and (*De facto*) are excluded by godly Ministers from the Lords Supper, ought also to be excluded from their childrens baptisme.

But such persons as the question mentions (*De jure*) ought, and (*De facto*) are excluded from the Lords Supper:

Ergo.

The minor I need not prove; our Ministers print their Books to defend the *jus* of it, they have gotten the Act of Parliament to back them in it, and *de facto* we see they doe it.

The major must be proved.

If Baptisme doth seale to the same Covenant which the Lords Supper doth, and doth signifie and seale as great blessings and priviledges as the Lords Supper doth, then those who are excluded from the Lords Supper, ought also to be excluded from their childrens baptisme: But the Antecedent is true, *ergo* the Consequent is true.

For the Antecedent; The Lords Supper is a seale belonging to the Covenant of Grace, so is Baptisme as well as that.

See the Assemblies large Catechism upon the question.

Baptisme is a signe and seale of our ingrafting into Christ, of remission of sins by his Bloud, of regeneration by his Spirit, of Adoption, &c. What higher priviledges have you in the Lords Supper? the ingrafting or being, is more then growth.

The Consequence I prove thus:

If the ground of exclusion from the Lords Supper be, because these persons doe not appeare to the regular judgement of charity, to be such to whom those Priviledges doe belong that there are held out; then the same ground excludes them from their childrens Baptisme; where are as high priviledges as in the Supper:

But that is the ground of exclusion; *ergo.*

My Argument runs upon my first supposition, that the childe brings nothing with it; considered as abstracted from

from the parent, but it is the parent gives the right.

I have obſerved, if the Lords Supper be adminiſtred at noon, it may be halfe the Pariſh is excluded; but let any of them, if ſix or more of them ſhould come in the afternoon to have their children baptized, they are admitted without any ſcruple.

I pray, thoſe whom you did exclude at noon, were they ſuch as did viſibly appeare to be under the Covenant of grace or not? if they did, why are they excluded? if not, why then do you give that Ordinance to the childe which muſt ſuppoſe the parent to be within the Covenant, and ſo the childe taken in with him? here is a Beleever and no beleever in three houres diſtance, it may be, and yet the man the ſame.

Obj. *A man may have a fundamentall right to the Lords Supper, but through ſome ſinne into which he is fallen and obſtinate, he may be ſuſpended from it, and yet have his right to Baptiſme?*

Anſ. 1. I am not againſt ſuſpenſion in ſome ſence, though I know many are; graduall and tender proceedings in weighty matters I approve of, unleſſe the caſe be very notorious; the inceſtuous perſon caſt out without any ſuſpenſion. *Ameſ.* Med. Theo. l. 1. c. 37. Th. 20.

2 But then I would make this Quære; Whether the parent being under ſinne, and obſtinate, and thereupon ſuſpended from the Supper, may not his childe alſo be ſuſpended for the preſent, till he declares his repentance, for the childe dependeth on the parent, and is eſteemed as he is in this caſe of Baptiſme?

3 But for the ſuſpenſion as it is in *England*, I know not what to thinke of it.

1 Did the Church proceed regularly, bring in their Witneſſes, and labour to convince him, bring him to a ſight of his ſinne, and humiliation for it, before they did ſuſpend him? alas, it is no ſuch matter; nay, the people are ſo accuſtomed to this, that they never trouble their Miniſters to deſire the Supper of them.

2 When you have ſuſpended, what doe you with them? what, follow them ſtil to bring them to confeſſion of, and humiliation for their ſinne? No ſuch matter, I never knew it to be ſo, if any doe ſo, I would not wrong them.

3 Suſpend them, but for how long? what, a yeare, nay

three, six, ten years, as many are, and more, and let them alone and proceed no further? This is strange suspension, how will you warrant this? Well, saith learned *Ames*, who doth approve of suspension; but saith he, *In isto tamen gradu non est subsistendum, sed respiscentia hoc pacto & spacio urgenda, & illa desperata, progrediendum tandem ad segregationem completam a communione fidelium.*

Medul. Theo. l. 1. c. 37. th. 22.

Mr. *Gillespie* in an answer to an Argument of Mr. *Prynns* thus saith; "Those who have been admitted to Baptisme, ought "to be admitted to the Lords Supper, *Cæteris paribus*; if the "proportion hold in particulars, if they be as free from scan-"dalous sins now when they desire to receive the Lords Sup-"per, as they were when they desired to receive baptisme: so I say, *Cæteris paribus*, if a man be as he was when his childe was baptized by vertue of him, if I can give the childe one seale of the Covenant by vertue of him, I will give him the other seale surely; and it was never any scruple to me to give that man the Lords Supper, by vertue of whom I could baptize his childe.

Aar. rod. p. 482

The next Argument proceeds thus:

Such Parents, as if they themselves were now to be baptized, ought not to be baptized, cannot justly challenge Baptisme for their children, neither are we bound to administer it.

But such Parents as the Question mentions, if they now were to be baptized, ought not to be baptized: *Ergo.*

The reason of the major lyes in this, because Baptisme doth primarily belong to the parent, and but secondarily to the childe by vertue of the parent; now if he who should convey this right to the childe, have no right to it himselfe, then he cannot give the right to the childe. The Lawyer saith, *A non habente potestatem*, Acts are frustrate; I justifie the parents right to Baptisme, in baptizing of his children.

For the minor, that such parents have no right, and ought not to be baptized; the grounds which I brought before, to prove that such a one was not fit matter for a Church, prove this also: But I shall adde more.

Obj. *The Apostles required no more to Baptisme but a profession of their beleefe, as* Acts 10. 47. *&* 8. 37. *&* 16. 31. 34. *but these doe*

pro-

profesſe ſo much: Ergo *the Parents have right to Baptiſme, and conſequently the childe.*

Anſ. 1. *Peter* did require more, *Act.* 2, 38. *John* did require more conſtantly.

2. To the places alledged I anſwer; There was not ſo much need of requiring more, for they in *Acts* 10. you may ſee what manner of perſons they were, by their converſation. The Eunuch, *Acts* 8. we may ſee what manner of perſon he was, comming to worſhip, and how he ſpent his time going home; the Jaylor now under the legall worke in a loſt condition for him to beleeve, it was his next worke; what is this to our ſleight profeſſion of Faith, but ignorant, or ſcandalous, &c. they were not.

3 *Auguſtine* directly anſwers to this Objection; Some it ſeems in his time upon a bare profeſſion of faith would baptize perſons, though otherwiſe ſcandalous, and objected this text of the Eunuch, in his booke, *De fide, & op. cap.* 9. in the beginning of the Chapter you may ſee what points of Catechiſme they were inſtructed in before Baptiſme, beſides the beleeving Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God, but how groſly ignorant are our people in them points, which I doe not tranſcribe. Then to the objection he anſwers, *In eo quod ait, Baptizavit eum Philippus, intelligi voluit impleta omnia, quæ licet taceantur in Scripturis gratia brevitatis, tamen ſerie traditionis ſcimus implenda.* Thoſe who read the whole Chapter will finde him ſtrong enough againſt this objection.

As for that Booke, *De fide & operibus*, in his Retractions, *l.* 2. *c.* 39. He gives the reaſon why he wrote the Booke, and what his ſcope was in it: *In quo diſputavi non ſolum quemadmodum vivere debeant gratia Dei regenerati, verum etiam quales ad lavacrum regenerationis admitti.* Thoſe who will beſtow the reading of Chap. 6. & 8. & 12. & 17. & 18. eſpecially, of that Book, ſhall finde I have a Champion on my ſide, proving that a bare profeſſion of faith is not ſufficient to entitle a man to baptiſme.

The *Catechumeni* in the Primitive times were ſuch, as I make no doubt for knowledge & converſation out-went thouſands of our *Engliſh* Proteſtants, they ſoon got more knowledge, & did quickly in two dayes, nay the firſt day, when they gave themſelves up to become Chriſtians, attaine as much as many of our ignorant ſort have, they owned Chriſt the firſt day,

and many of ours do no more. What these *Catechumeni* were instructed in, *Augustin* gives a short compendium, *de fide & op.* c. 6. towards the end. But these *Catechumeni* were not at the very first baptized, but after they came to be *competentes*, &c.

If we aske the Schoolmen, they will tells us, there is more required to Baptisme, then a bare sleight profession of faith.

p.4 q.8.ar.2. *Alex. Hales* saith, *in adulto accedente ad Baptismum requiritur contritio, licet originale peccatum non impediat gratiam baptismalem quando habeat effectum in baptizato, tamen actuale impedit in adulto non contrito.*

p.3 q 68.a.4. *Aquinas* saith, *Peccatoribus, voluntatem peccandi, & in peccato perseverendi propositum habentibus, baptismus minime conferendus est, &c.*

And in his Answer to the second Argument he speaks plainly. *Spiritualis medecus scil: Christus, operatur dupliciter, uno modo interius per seipsum, & sic præparat voluntatem hominis, ut bonum velit, & malum odiat: alio modo operatur per ministros exterius adhibendo Sacramenta, & sic operatur perficiendo exterius id quod est interius inchoatum.* Et *ideo*, Sacramentum Baptismi non est exhibendum, nisi ei, in quo interioris conversionis aliquod signum apparet: *sicut nec medicina corporalis adhibetur infirmo, nisi in eo aliquis motus vitalis naturæ appareat.*

Who desires more then *Aquinas* hath affirmed.

Greg.: de Valen. He also is strong against this, and bestowes To.4. disp.4. q. 3 p.3. paines about the question, he saith, *ut adulti rectè accipiant baptismum, atque etiam ut eis rectè* i.e. *sine mortali peccato* Administretur, *necessarium est ut eos præteritorum peccatorum mortalium pœniteat & est certissima ecclesiæ doctrina contra nonnullos veteres hæreticos, qui solam fidem, ut baptismus prodesset, requirendam putabant.* In his esteeme then they are but Hereticks that say onely Faith is enough to intitle to Baptism, and quotes that book of *Augustin* of which I made mention before: this he doth not barely assert, but proves, by *Act*: 2. where *Peter* bids them repent, &c. he quotes other Texts to good purpose, *Heb:* 6. and *Rom:* 6. and 1 *Pet.*6.3. and *Matth:* 7. *give not that which is holy unto dogs*, and *Matth:* 28. *Docete omnes gentes, baptizantes*, &c. i.e. *persuadete simul, ut velint esse & fieri Christi discipuli, abjecta veteri consuetudine*

pec-

peccatorum per pœnitentiam. So *Matth.*3. *John* required repentance.

After this he moves a queſtion, what manner of repentance is required? and anſwers, *Sufficere qualemcunque pœnitentiam imperfectam, quæ tamen abſolutè re moveat Affectum ad peccatum*, i. e. *faciat ut non amplius vigeat.* Whether this repentance be cauſed from ſin, as it is an offence to God, or as it hath the guilt of eternall death accompanying it, or what ever cauſe (though ſome, he ſaith after, as *Navarrus*, &c. contend that it muſt be for ſin, as it is an offence to God) yet he ſaith, from what principles ſoever this repentance for ſin flowes, it muſt have this effect, to take away the affection to ſin, ſo as it may not grow nor flouriſh more.

So alſo *Durandes*, who denies indeed, that *Contritio* muſt be neceſſarily required before Baptiſme, yet there is, *quædam diſplicentia peccati Commiſſi licet informis & imperfecta, quæ dicitur attritio, quæ licet non ſit ſufficiens ad dolendum peccatum, eſt tamen diſpoſitio ſufficiens ad ſuſcipiendum baptiſmum, eò quod* tollit Fictionem. And this ſaith he is meant in *Act.*2. l.4.diſp. 4.q.2.

Repentance then muſt be joyned with faith in thoſe who are admitted to baptiſme (if *adulti*) in the Schoolmens opinion. This is more then a ſleight profeſſion, to ſay, I beleeve in Chriſt: yea, or a ſleight confeſſion of ſin; which M. *Prynn* ſpeaks of.

Learned *Gilleſpie* I find very ſtrong for me in this point. Aar.rod 482.

Whereas Mr. *Prynn* had affirmed that in the Apoſtles times, a meer externall ſleight confeſſion of ſin [which is more] and profeſſion of Faith, was ſufficient to inable ſinners to be baptized. He Anſwers, I utterly deny it as moſt falſe, and as a reproach caſt upon the Apoſtles, and ſo anſwers to that of *Phillips* baptizing *Simon magus*, he ſhould have proved (ſaith he) that *Simon Magus* was known to be in the gall of bitterneſſe, when *Phillip* baptized him.

After this he ſaith, we read of no perſons of age baptized by the Apoſtles, except ſuch as did profeſſe faith in Chriſt, gladly received the Word, and in whom ſome begun work of the ſpirit of grace did appear [though it may be not real.] *Aquinas* ſaid as much before. p.514.

I beleeve (ſaith he) no conſciencious Miniſter would adventure to baptize one who hath manifeſt and infallible ſignes of p.515.

un-

unregeneration, wee cannot be answerable to God if wee should, &c.

If it were a prophanation of baptisme, to baptize a *Catechumeni*, a *Jew*, or a *Pagan* professing a resolution to turne Christian, he being manifestly under the power of abominable
p. 544. reigning sins, and still a wicked liver, although he were able to give a sound and Orthodox Confession of Faith, then the Lords Supper, &c.

His minde then is, a bare profession of Faith is not sufficient.

Thousands of ours can give no Orthodox confession, they are so ignorant, and thousands as scandalous.

The Minor is proved.

Obj. *But the Parent is baptized, and that gives right.* Ergo. *This supposition is nothing.*

Answ: Does the Church perform their duty, in suffering such a person to continue in the Church, who show not so much as giveth a right to Baptisme? Exercise Discipline then.

But this intimates clearly, that it is the Parents being baptized which gives the Title, yea, and this alone, for though the person cannot be judged fit to give the right upon other grounds, as being a visible Saint, and Church member, yet his baptism will do it.

1 Hence I argue, If the Parents baptism gives the right to the Infants baptism, then an excommunicate person may justly challenge baptisme for his child. The Consequence is clear.

The Excommunicate person doth not loose his Baptisme.

But the excommunicate person cannot justly challenge: As before proved.

Ergo:

2 I would put this case, suppose a man to be newly converted to the faith, and so as he appears a reall Convert, he also is admitted into the Church this day, but possibly, not baptized that day, but it is deferred to the next; but on the sudden he is taken sick, and by reason of this, baptisme cannot be administred unto him, and possibly he dyeth of his disease: [the story of *Valentinianus* sending to *Ambrose* for his baptisme, is well

well knowne, who dyed before he was baptized] ſuppoſe in this time while he lyes in his ſickneſſe, he ſhould have a childe borne unto him, now what would our Divines doe with this childe, baptize it or not? the Father is not baptized as yet, nor can receive it, but he is a member of the Church, and for ought we can ſee a godly man, I preſume charity would ſtrain hard before we would deny the childe baptiſme; then it is not the baptiſme of the parent that conveyes the right, for here is one baptiſed [the excommunicate perſon]and yet his childe ought not to be baptized, and here is one not baptized, and yet his childe may be baptized

So that I conceive it is the Parents being viſibly in Covenant, and joyned to the Church, which as it is the ground of his owne baptiſme, ſo it is that which doth primarily, and radically convey the right to the childe.

For thoſe who conceive that it is baptiſme which makes us members of a Church, my former ſuppoſition will be ſleighted by them; but I am ſure all Divines are not of that mind, nor will reaſon force it. What were all the children of the *Jewes* before they were eight dayes old? or in caſe they were ſick, and ſo their Circumciſion was deferred, were they not looked upon as members of the *Jewiſh* Church, together with their parents? if ſo, then Circumciſion did not make them members.

Baptiſme is a priviledge belonging only to a Church, therefore it ſuppoſes a Church, and that Organicall, for none but Officers can diſpenſe it, what was it then firſt made this Church?

If baptiſme make a man a member of a Church, what doe you when you diſmember a man by excommunication, doe you null his baptiſme.

Ameſius anſwering to *Bellarm.* who had ſaid, *Non baptizati hæretici excommunicati, &c. non ſive de eccleſia,* ſaith thus: *De infantibus fidelium, & fidelibus nondum baptizatis, adeò manifeſtè falſum eſt quod affirmatur, ut niſi habendi tales eſſent pro membris eccleſiæ, non deberent baptizari Baptiſmus enim ſua natura eſt ſigillum inſitionis jam factæ in Chriſtum atque adeo in eccleſiam,* Act. 10. 47, 48. *Bull. enc. to. 2. l. 2. c. 1.*

3 My third argument is this:

If Miniſters in baptizing are bound to hold to their Commiſſion, then the children of ſuch parents as the queſtion mentions are not to be baptized.

But the Antecedent is true, none will deny that; *ergo* the Conſequence is true.

The Conſequence: Miniſters by their Commiſſion [*Matth.* 28. 19. μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες] are bound to baptize Diſciples.

But theſe are no Diſciples: *Ergo.*

My Argument tends to this; If the parent be not a Diſciple, the childe is none; but ſuch a parent is none, *ergo* his childe is none.

The Anabaptiſts here triumph. This is the text they thinke overthrowes all who baptize infants; but I eaſily can diſtinguiſh between a Church as it is *conſtituenda, & conſtituta*; as now in *New England*, they preach to the Indians, and labour to make them Diſciples, having ſo done, no doubt when the parents are baptized, the infants ſhall alſo be baptized. Our Divines have cleared that text I think ſufficiently, that it is no hinderance, but rather proves the baptizing of infants. I ſhall deſire to adde one anſwer more then yet I finde.

1 Suppoſe Chriſt had not at all changed the Seale of the Covenant of Grace, but let Circumciſion have been the initiating ſeale to the Gentiles as well as to the Jewes, yet no doubt when Chriſt ſent forth his Diſciples with his Commiſſion, he would have ſaid, μαθητεύσατε περιτέμνοντες *Goe teach all Nations, circumciſing them*; for I hope he would not have them circumciſed before they had been taught; but if it had been ſo, who would ever have doubted but if the Father had been circumciſed, the childe had been alſo, when they ſaw it was ſo practiſed among the Jewes, and Proſelytes alſo for ſo many hundred yeares, I am confident none would ever have queſtioned the thing; the converted Jewes, *Acts* 21. 21. did not thinke their children excluded, but they would circumciſe their children, though now Circumciſion was aboliſhed; but Circumciſion was a ſeale of the Covenant of Grace as well as Baptiſme; why therefore ſhould this text make more againſt Baptizing then Circumciſion? This for the text.

2 Further, the Anabaptiſts make the ſilence of the New Teſtament concerning infant baptiſme to be a great argument againſt

againſt it, to me it is a great argument for it, which I make thus to appeare.

We know the nulling of Circumciſion, what a duſt it made in the Churches in the Apoſtles time, how they were troubled with it, as witneſſe *Pauls* Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, ſo to the *Philippians*, and that, *Act.* 15. a long journey it coſt him, the Synod is called, the buſineſſe is about Circumciſion, the cleareſt ground we have for a Synod was occaſioned upon this queſtion; now Circumciſion was but an externall ſeale of the Covenant of Grace, and that a painfull Ordinance; when it was removed they had another come in the roome, as ſignificant as that, and more eaſie, it is but the change of the Seale; now if the change only of a Seale made ſuch a ſtirre in the Churches, as I have ſhowne, then ſurely the caſting out of all their Poſterity, and not giving them any initiating ſeale in the roome of Circumciſion would have made a greater duſt; For circumciſion it is a fair anſwer; O *Jews*, we have done you no harme, though you have this removed, here is another come in the roome of it more eaſie, ſignificant, &c. But ſuppoſe the *Jewes* and *Gentiles* converted had ſaid; But what doe you with our Poſterity, muſt not they have this Ordinance as well as we? what, do you caſt them out of the Church? where ſhall we finde an anſwer to this in all the New Teſtament, for the children being excluded, there is not one text or ſillable *nè γρν quidem*, in all the New Teſtament, as I ſaid, *Act.* 21. 21. they did thinke their Children ſhould be taken in with them; had *Paul* taught them, you muſt not Circumciſe your Children, nor Baptize them, this had been ſomething, but the ſtirre, as you may ſee by *Act.* 15. was not in regard of the ſubject, the childe, but the Circumciſion.

I am confident it would have been as great a block to hinder the *Jewes* from receiving of Chriſt, as could be. What, this is a ſtrange Doctrine, that whereas our children have before been owned with us under the Covenant; here is a Doctrine caſts them out, and leaves them as the Heathen.

The Anabaptiſts then muſt bring me as expreſſe texts, to prove that the Infants of Beleevers muſt now be left out, and not owned in the Covenant with their parents, as I can bring them expreſſe texts, that Circumciſion is aboliſhed, or

elſe I will never beleeve their Doctrine.

3 Another Argument fell in my courſe, preaching through the ſecond of the *Epheſians*, in verſ. 11. the Apoſtle to make the *Epheſians* highly to prize the eſtate they were brought into by the Free Grace of God, and Chriſt, he puts them in minde of their miſerable and forlorne condition they were in before; this is reckoned up as one thing to ſet it out, *they were Gentiles in the fleſh, called uncircumciſion by that which is called Circumciſion*; this was the initiating ſeale then: Now, who are called thus uncircumciſion? The Gentile parent and his childe; Who called him ſo? The *Jew* Circumciſed and his childe, if then the *Gentile* beleever is baptized himſelfe, but the children are not, then this which is reckoned as a note of the miſerable and forlorn condition of the Gentile before his converſion, is ſtill upon him after his converſion, in the greateſt part; the *Epheſians* might well have anſwered; nay *Paul*, you ſhall not need to reckon up that as one thing to ſet out our miſery by, for that ſtill is upon us in greateſt part, for though we our ſelves are taken into Covenant, and have the initiating ſeale, yet our children have it not, but are left as Heathens ſtill, but ſo were not they who call us the uncircumciſion. Let therefore the parent and the children alſo be taken in, then it is removed, as no doubt the 19. ver. proves. fellow Citizens.

4 Another argument I would uſe is this; we finde many promiſes made to the poſterity of godly parents, *Gen.* 17. 7. *Exod.* 20. 6. *Pſal.* 112. 2. *Prov.* 20. 7. *Iſa.* 44. 3, 4. & 54. 13. now if the children of ſuch parents ſhall grow up, and though they are but young, yet reading, they finde ſuch promiſes, or heare of them; it ſeemes theſe poore children muſt not now goe and lay hold of the Promiſe, claime it by vertue of their parents; if they ſhould goe and ſpread theſe promiſes before the Lord, and plead; Lord, haſt not thou made theſe promiſes to the children of godly parents, I am ſure my Father, or my Mother was ſuch a one, now Lord make good theſe promiſes to me, who am the childe of ſuch; this were nothing, for ſure if God will not ſo much as give them an outward ſeale of the Covenant by vertue of the parent, the poore childe cannot plead theſe promiſes which come by the parent; but what uſe ſuch promiſes are of to the children of ſuch parents

rents (I thank God) I know by experience, who [though I have a moſt wretched heart] would not part with theſe promiſes out of Gods book for the beſt eſtate of any *Anabaptiſt* in *England*, the Lord (I praiſe him) hath taught me from a youth to plead the promiſes, yea, and when I could finde no other bottome to pitch on in times of temptations and ſearchings, I have run to theſe promiſes and pleaded, Lord I own my Fathers Covenant, I ſtand to that; and have reſolved to go to hel with theſe Promiſes if I do go, and here I have found ſome ſtay. Now the word having experience joyned to it, is to me more then all the talk of Anabaptiſts.

To put an end to this, and ſo return to our Argument. The more I ſtudy this Doctrin of the Anaptiſts, I thank God the more I ſee into the falſehood and vileneſſe of it, and do think that holy and learned Mr. *Hooker* hath not paſſed too ſharpe a cenſure upon it, when he calls it, *The wretched Doctrin of the Anabaptiſts*. Survey of Diſc. p. 38.

Now to return to the Commiſſion, Perſons made Diſciples, by teaching or calling [as ſay the *London* Miniſters before] theſe are ſuch as muſt be baptized. Some of our Divines obſerving what uſe the Anabaptiſts make of μαθητεύσατε *make ye Diſciples* they anſwer it is a Criticiſm, and ſo wave it; but I think we ſha, not need to be ſo ſhy of it, let them take their notion, it ſhall not trouble me; for I make no queſtion when I baptize thI Infant of a parent that is a Diſciple, I baptize alſo an In-e fant Diſciple. But if the parent be not a Diſciple, then I cannot look at the child as ſuch, which is the thing my Argument looks at.

But for this word, μαθητεύσατε, to be thus rendred, certainly that *John* 4.1. doth make it clear, when the Phariſee heard, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, &c. Whence Mr. *Cartwright*, *quod autem dicitur feciſſe & baptizaſſe diſcipulos, ſicut* Mat. 28. 19. μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες. *Docetur prius eſſe Diſcipulos Chriſti, quam baptiſmi Sacramento obſignantur: adverſus illos qui baptiſmo Chriſtianos fieri putant*, &c. He then renders the word ſo, and ſo doe others who are no Anabaptiſts: As Zanchy. *Conſtituite mihi diſcipulos*, *hoc enim eſt propriè* μαθητεύειν, *facere*, μαθητὰς. So *Gerhard in loc.* So *Pareus in loc.* In ſecon. pars. p. 440.

Nay, reaſon will force it, for what if you teach the Nations, ſuppoſe they will not receive your doctrine, will you bap-

tize them? no sure, but as Mr. *Gillespy* cited before, *None were baptized except such as did professe their faith in Christ, gladly received the word, and some worke of the spirit of grace begun* (at least *apparenter.*) Now these are Disciples, and preaching is to bring people to this. He speaks *de adultis,* You must teach the Covenant, and they must understand it, and submit to it (appearingly at least) before we can give the seale of the Covenant.

Now shall we call them persons in the question, Disciples, when as they are sottishly ignorant in the very fundamentalls of Religion, or scandalous, or scoffers, or being convinced of discipline, yet will not stoop to it? Wil we admit of such Schollars into a School, that wil come and learn as they please, and do what they please, but tel their Master he shal use no discipline? no sure.

For making them Disciples by calling. I am very much inclined to think, that much of our Religion is grounded upon the State, & taking up by tradition; it appears so, by many in their wofull ignorance, and so Ministers speak in their Sermons. But for calling by the word, either by Catechism when they were young, or by the word preached. I beleeve the word never had any effect upon them, hence we find them have a notion, God is merciful, and we must repent, and this is all. For the State, though I conceive the State is bound to compel the Subjects to attend upon converting Ordinances, yet they have not power to compell the Ministery to give the Sacraments, but where the word doth seem (at least *apparenter*) to have had some effect. To call very ignorant persons, scandalous, scorners of the Members of Christ, that can jeer at them, and hate them, and who refuse to stoop to his discipline, Christs disciples, I think no serious Minister wil do it. If then the parent be no Disciple, the childe is none, therefore I go beyond my commission when I baptize such a one.

4 I shall but touch two Arguments more.

To administer the seale of the Covenant of grace to a childe, by vertue of him who is visibly in Covenant with Satan, must needs be a prophaning of the Ordinance.

But to administer baptisme to a child by vertue of such a one as the question mentions, is to administer the seal of the

the Covenant of grace to a child by vertue of one who is visibly in Covenant with Satan. *Ergo*.

For the Major, you say it is a prophaning of the Lords Supper to admit such an one to it, *ergo*, you exclude him, and may not the Sacrament of baptisme be prophaned as well, having as great priviledges signified by it?

For the Minor. A person grosly ignorant in the fundamentalls of Religion, his course of life, his trade, is to live in sinne, scandalous, &c. what shall wee say of such an one: though he doth not formally make a Covenant with the Devill, yet we know in what sense we take such expressions of our Ministers.

I wonder how Ministers pray when they baptize the childe of such an one, they cannot but have some eye to Gods Covenant, and do we not mention so much to the Lord, that he having taken the parent into Covenant with himselfe, he doth also the seed of the Parent; and so we plead the Covenant, and a blessing, &c. but when a godly Minister shall carry the parent in his heart thus, doth not his heart check him, trouble him in the thought of the Parent?

If you say the parent is in Covenant, for he is baptized, I should give my former answer. And further I say, if he be in Covenant, why doe you constantly exclude him from the Lords Supper, and not proceed, as I said in my first Argument?

If you say it is not by vertue of him but his Predecessors, I shall desire to see more light first, and what I have said to that question clearly removed.

5 I shall not draw these into form, but I desire they may be seriously considered.

1 How exceedingly this Ordinance is sleighted, abused, through this heedles administring of the Ordinance, for we see persons never minde the Ordinance before hand, nor after; but *come let us have our children baptized*, and that is all, if they can make a Feast and drinke after it, that is well. Why do we tell people of preparing themselves to the Lords Supper, and not as wel to this, I know of no Ordinance so abused as this is, and this hardens men, and settleth them on their lees, for if they come to Church, and have their children baptized what care they for more.

2 Be-

2 Besides, it is strange to see how we jumble the most holy and prophane men in the Nation together; if Master *Greenham*, Mr. *Perkins*, Mr. *Rogers*, Mr. *Dod*, or whom you will, should come and bring their children to be baptized, let the most ignorant sot, Drunkard, Swearer, uncleane person, scorner of godlinesse, &c. come, he shall have his childe baptized as well as they; Have they their children taken into Covenant? so have I, sayes the Drunkard, Swearer, &c. Shall we owne all these men alike under the Covenant, so as to give the seale of the Covenant alike to all?

Would not a serious Minister having two children brought together to baptize, the parents of these children stand by, the father of the one a holy man, the father of the other a very wretch, a mock-God, (the mothers of the children also differ as much) for the Minister now to joyne both these together in his prayer, and administer the seale of the Covenant to both alike by vertue of these parents, would it not trouble him in his Act?

Obj. *But to come to the great objection; The Jewes though very wicked, had their children circumcised*; ergo.

Ans. I confesse this is a hard knot to untye, I desire some who have better fingers then I, would lend their help here, I shall propound my thoughts by way of answer.

Aar. rod. c. 4. There was excommunication among the Jewes, those who deny it let them grapple with stout *Gillespie*, who proves it, and shewes the causes of their excommunication, some whereof Christians may be guilty of; if persons were excommunicated, some say their children were not circumcised, as I quoted Mr. *Gillespie* before; but I doe not much presse this.

2 I conceive for ignorance they were not so guilty as are many of ours, though the knowledge of Christ was very little, yet in *Moses* Law they trained up their children, better *Synag. Jud. c. 3.* then thousands of ours; what care they have *Buxtorfe* reports, though it is very much to observe, they should be so unacquainted with the Prophets, where Christ is most made knowne under the Old Testament, as he relates.

But to come more close to the answer.

1 I desire my reverend Fathers and Brethren would give me cleare proofe, that the Priests did debarre thousands of the

the people from the Passeover for morrall uncleannesses [for as for Ceremoniall uncleannesses they doe not trouble us, we can admit such to the Lords Supper] and thus they did debarre them six, ten, twenty yeares together [as our Divines doe thousands in this Kingdome, though they have the Lords Supper oftner then they had the Passeover] and yet though they were thus debarred, they did circumcise their children, [as our Divines doe baptize, notwithstanding their suspension, and that without any paines to bring them to humiliation, &c.] this now will speake something if it can be proved, but I must have good grounds to beleeve it.

2 I conceive there was something peculiar to them in the constitution of their Jewish Nationall Church, from ours under the Gospell; there God takes *Abraham*, enters into Covenant with him, layes the foundation of the Church in his Family, and commands him to circumcise his seed; the constitution of our Churches doe not begin with any particular person, *but, make Disciples, and baptize.* Now though I conceive the discending from *Abraham* according to the flesh was not the sole ground of administring Circumcision, yet I am apt to thinke there was something peculiar to them, in being *Israel after the flesh*; and these grounds lead me to think so.

1 When these Jewes came to *Johns* baptisme, they were not admitted without any more adoe, but he required confession of sins first, repentance; it was not sufficient to plead we are *Abrahams* Seed, therefore baptize us, as well as we are circumcised by being his Seed; but as I said, he requireth repentance, yea and so as Mr. *Gillespie* conceives, that *John* did not baptize those Pharisees, and concludes with the Centurists, *John did not cast pearls before Swine; he did not admit rashly any that would, to baptisme, but such as confessed their sins; that is, only such as were tryed, and did repent, but the contumacious, and the defenders of their impieties he did reject.* *Aar.rod,p. 553* p. 555.

2 We observe when they fell into that foule Apostasie, yet their children were Circumcised, whether regularly or no I leave that; but I would desire whether if any of our Church-Members should apostatize to so foule Idolatries, as the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, *Baal*, the offering of their children to *Moloch*, that uncleane god *Priapus* [which learned Divines con-

Burrough on the text.

ceive to be the meaning of that place, *Hos.* 4. 14. *Themselves are separated with whores, &c.* Would you baptize their children? I doubt holy men would not doe it, you would suspend their baptisme a while till they had repented, and declared their hatred against such Idols.

3 I observe, when they admitted any Heathens into the Church of *Israel*, they were very exact, as Mr. *Ainsworth* notes out of *Maimonid.* on *Gen.* 17. 12. they make *diligent inquiry, lest they come to get themselves under the Law for riches, dignity, or feare, or love to some Jewish woman, or man; if no such like occasion be found in them, then they make knowne to them the weightinesse of the yoke of the Law, and the toyle that is in doing thereof, to see if they will leave off; if they see they with-draw not, and see them that they come of love, then they receive them,* as *Ruth.* 1. 18. now this is more then for one to come and professe he did beleeve in the God of *Israel*, therefore Circumcise me, &c. as some conceive a bare profession that they beleeve in Christ gives right to baptism; the Jews being trained up in their Fathers religion, and the religion of the Nation, may seeme all of them to have this which they required of the Proselytes, but I should preferre these things in a Proselyte, before the same things in a meere carnall Jew.

3 It is true, the wicked Jewes being members of that Nationall Church so long as their Membership held, they might challenge Circumcision; so for wicked persons so long as they continue members, and the Church lets them alone, they may challenge baptisme; but our question is, whether such persons should be let alone, is not that Church to blame? though they are *de facto*, members through want of the exercise of Discipline, yet the question is *de jure*, ought such to be members?

4 I conceive what-ever the Church of the Jewes was, the Churches under the Gospel must look to some with more strictnesse, though I allow not that strictnesse and ridgednesse which some would have, (for an errour on the right hand is an errour as well as an errour on the left) yet I beleeve some more strictnesse; there is ground why it should be so.

1. We have more light then ever the Jews had, in the knowledge of Christ especially; they had the shadow, we the body; hence

hence the Apostle, *Gal.* 4. 1. &c. compares the time of the Jewish Church, to the time of child-hood.

2 The Spirit of God is more given out under the Gospel then before, if we consider the bulke of Christians, Gods people have more of the Spirit now then his owne had under the Law, and so I beleeve the same Spirit doth restraine more under the Gospel, such as come not to reality of grace; I will not enlarge upon this head.

1 Hence we finde in Scripture, *Ezek.* 44. 7. 9. (which respects the Churches under the Gospel) God reproveth not only the bringing of Strangers into his Sanctuary who were uncircumcised in the flesh, but the bringing of those who were uncircumcised in heart; that is, known to be such, for *De secretis non judicat ecclesia*; such ought not to have fellowship in holy things.

2 Hence againe we finde the condition of the Churches under the New Testament set downe, *Isa.* 52. 1. which Master *Gillespie* proves to be understood of a Church visible, and ministeriall. *Aar.* rod p. 107.

3 Hence we finde the Churches of *Asia* commended, or reproved, as they kept their Churches from pollution, or suffered wicked persons to live in them, *Revel.* 2.

4 Hence we finde Church Discipline more clearly layed open in the New Testament then in the Old, *Mat.* 18. 15, &c.

5 Hence, 2 *Thes.* 3. 12. 14. we finde *Paul* writing to the Churches, to note such persons who did not obey the Word, though but an idle person.

6 Hence we finde a command to exercise Discipline against severall persons, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11.

Of this last text a few words; *No not to eate.* Some, and most Divines that I see say, it doth prove suspension from the Lords Table, and Excommunication; some Divines I have heard, [but read very few] say it is meant only of civill familiarity; so I heard Mr. *Edwards* once in the Pulpit, so another, whom I must reverence. Mr. *Prynne* he is so peremptory in it, that he scornes all the Divines who have affirmed the contrary.

For the godly Ministers who are of Mr. *Prynns* judgement, I shall but only propound one question to them; If that be your opinion of the place, then what is the reason your Parishes

have been so long destitute of the Lords Supper? Why are you so troubled to thinke of one? Is it not because there are companies of rusty, rugged, rich fellowes in our Parishes, bad enough, who will croud in if we goe about it? but what I pray would you have these doe, keep off? sure if so, you will confirme the interpretation to be meant of suspension at least, that is, *Excommunicatio minor*, and what is the cause of that, if obstinacy continues, will deserve the higher excommunication; I would never scruple the giving of the Lords Supper to all my Parish [if they have but knowledge] if that text respects only civill familiarity.

But I shall proceed, and set down some Divines of no small note, who are for the first interpretation, and that it is meant of Excommunication, I doe not set downe their words, because of trouble, but if you please to read these places I referre to, you shall finde what I affirme.

August. Homil. 50. *Calvin* in *Loc. & institu. l.* 4. *c.* 12. *Sect.* 4, 5 *Beza* his *Annota.* on the ninth *v.* of the Chap. *Zanch.* in 4th. *Precep. p.* 742, 743. *Chemniti.* in *Joh.* 9. 22. *& Mat.* 18. 17. *Hemming. in Loc. Pareus in loc. Piscator* in his fourth and fifth observations upon the chap. The *Heyden* Profess. *Synop. Theol. disp.* 48. *Thes.* 25. *Amesius de consc. l.* 4. *c.* 29. *Th.* 30. *Diodati* his *Annot.* upon the text, our *English* Annot. upon the 9. & 11 *ver.* of the *cha.* Mr. *Hooker. Surv of Chur. Discip. par.* 3. *p.* 39. the Synod of *New England*, their *confession of Church Discipline*, Mr. *Gillespie*, who answers Mr. *Prynne*, and quotes *P. Martyr*, *Gualter*, *Tossanus*, the *Centuriists* [which I have not] all which expound it of Excommunication.

Now though I doe not pin my faith upon any mans sleeve, yet I would see very good reasons why I should differ so much in the interpretation of a text, from so many men, so holy and learned as many of these were, and are, whom I have quoted; neither had Mr. *Prynne* been esteemed the lesse godly and learned, if he had showne more respect to such as have interpreted for suspension, or excommunication.

Vindica. p. 2. For Mr. *Prynne* I leave him to Mr. *Gillespie*, only one thing I take notice of, he is content to yeeld that some persons may be excommunicated, and all the warrant he gives us for excommunication is from 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. *It is readily yeelded, that grosse notc-*

rious

rious, scandalous, obstinate sinners, who presumptuously persevere in their iniquities, after private and publike admonitions, without remorse of Conscience, or amendment, may be justly excommunicated from the Church, the society of the faithfull, and all publick Ordinances, after due proof, and legall conviction of their scandalous lives; and that, 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. *warrants thus much, notwithstanding the various readings of the text.* Thus M. *Pryn*

I perceive according to Master *Prynne*, excommunication reacheth but a few, and Ministers will have much trouble when they goe about it; for the persons must be grosse notorious sinners, obstinate, such as doe presumptuously persevere? What need these words? *Paul* saith, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. If any man obey not our word, &c. note that man; though but an idle person who will not labour, *ver.* 12. Now is this such a grosse notorious sin with Mr. *Pryn*? the incestuous person, we doe not finde he did presumptuously persevere after private and publike admonition, for the Church was negligent, yet *Paul* bids them put him away. Why will not obstinacy in a lesser sin, though not so grosly notorious, deserve excommunication? for the exclusion of excommunicate persons from all Ordinances [the word preaching, which is the meanes to convince and humble, and to which the Heathens are admitted] it is more then ever I saw practised among the Churches of *New England*, neither can I see any reason for it, but I aime at something else; that text, he saith, warrants excommunication, but none else in all the Bible; for he disputes against all the rest, that our Divines bring for excommunication, at least the most eminent texts, as *Matthew* 18. 17. which is not meant he saith of excommunication; the warrant then Master *Prynne* gives us is from these words, *Therefore put away from your selves that wicked person.* I suppose when Mr. *Prynne* tells us what persons he would have excommunicated, he means all such persons so quallified as he there sets down. Though he hath not put the note of universality to his long Proposition, yet he meanes, it is a universall Proposition. Then let us see how that Text proves his proposition.

The Apostle in those words doth but apply his former discourse unto that particular incestuous person, then Mr. *Prynns* argument must run thus.

The Inceſtuous perſon was to be excommunicated.

Ergo, All groſſe notorious ſinners, that preſumptuouſly perſevere after admonitions [which it ſeems this perſon had not] are to be excommunicated.

What logick have we here? a univerſall Concluſion in a Contract Syllogiſme? draw it into forme and ſee how it runs.

The Inceſtuous perſon was a notorious ſinner, &c. as Mr. *Prynne* deſcribes.

The Inceſtuous perſon was excommunicated.

Ergo, All notorious ſinners, &c. are to bee Excommunicated.

This is no good logicke, ſince Mr. *Prynn* denies all other Texts to prove excommunication but this, I cannot tell how he will prove that any but ſuch Inceſtuous perſons as this perſon was, of whom the Text ſpeakes, ſhould be excommunicated.

Pauls logick is very good.

All ſcandalous impenitent ſinners within the Church, are to be excommunicated, *v.* 11.

The Inceſtuous perſon, is a ſcandalous impenitent ſinner within the Church.

Ergo, The Inceſtuous perſon is to bee excommunicated.

If any Object. Neither can we prove the excommunication of all notorious, obſtinate ſinners from that, *v.* 11. *Ergo*, Neither is your logick good,

I Anſwer, There was no need why the Apoſtle ſhould reckon up all ſcandalous ſinners that muſt be excommunicated in one verſe. But.

1 We having a general rule, *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, &c. [it is a very abſurd conceit of them, who expound the offence there mentioned, to be only ſome private injury which my brother may offer me; it is ſpoken to often enough, therefore I leave it.]

2 We having other texts that guide us, as 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. which is alſo a generall rule, and *Tit.* 3. 10. & 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. for hereſie.

3 The Apoſtle in this eleventh verſe, enumerating divers Sins, Fornication, Drunkenneſſe, Idolatry, Extortion, Covetouſneſſe, railing, [not ſpeaking of one particular perſon,

as

as that clause in the 13.v. expresseth] he Apostle need not reckon up all sins: These by a rule of proportion, with other texts being laid together, will help us to draw out a universall proposition concerning persons that should be excommunicated, better then that one particular example, which only he will allow us to be a warrant for excommunication of all notorious sinners; I could draw out the proposition from these three heads, but it is so obvious to any intelligent Readers eye, that I spare the paines, I leave Mr. *Prynne*, and goe to the text. It is worth the observation what Mr. *Gillespie* saith: *Had the Apostle said simply, not to eate, the argument for civill familiarity had been more colourable; but after he had twice said, not to keep company,* to adde, *no not to eate,* doth plainly intimate the Apostle argueth from the lesse to the greater, and that there is some other fellowship with such a one, &c. Aar. rod. 4. 7.

For my part, it seemes strange to me, that a man should be reputed a Brother, a member of a Church, admitted to all the Ordinances, under no Censure, and yet I must not shew him so much familiarity as I may a Heathen, to whom I may goe if he invites me: 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. but not to my broth er, after excommunication, indeed the verse takes place;

Os, orare, vale, convivia, mensa negatur:

but before excommunication I never heard that it did, I have eate with *Indians* divers times, and that was no trouble to me; but one time being at a godly friends house, where one of the Family (a Sonne) was excommunicated, it did a little at first trouble me, [not out of any self conceited holinesse, which Mr. *Prynne* thinks is the ground why Ministers do thus labour to keep Churches cleare; such as upon any such grounds doe refuse to goe to a Sacrament, let them beare the blame] but I at last recalled my selfe; for Politicall and Oeconomicall communion which hath its obligation from the Law of Nature, and Excommunication doth not solve from that; yet I did desire to deale faithfully with the party afterward. Vindic p. 28.

Further, the Argument the Apostle uses in the sixth and seventh verses, to move the Church to cast out the incestuous person, that is, from the dangerous effect which may follow, set out under that similitude taken from leaven, it is of force against these sins mentioned in *ver.* 11. for surely Fornicators, Vid. Pasca. Parc. in loc.

Drunk-

Drunkards, &c. are as apt to leaven others as the incestuous person was; *Impunitas vitiorum alios ad peccandum invitat*, as *Pareus* notes; and here Mr. *Prynn* may see the reason why we would be carefull to exclude such, not because we conceive our selves to be too holy for such to communicate with, but because our hearts are dough fit to be infected with such leaven; That the Church may be a pure and cleane body, something like othe blessed head, as the seventn verse implies. That we may be faithfull Stewards in dispensing the holy things of God, 1 *Cor.* 4. 2. That we may use all means to save the soule, verse 5.

Doida. in loc.

Something I observe out of *ver.* 12. which seemes to me to prove this *no not to eate*, must be meant of excommunication, or suspension at least, the verse doth depend upon the 10. & 11. *vers.* that is cleare enough; therein he gives a reason of the precedent limitation to the members of the Church; for *what have I to doe to judge, &c. Doe not ye judge them that are within?* so that by this verse hanging on the former, it should seeme *Paul* did there judge such persons; now what judgement hath the Church but Suspension and Excommunication? doctrinall judging is not only meant, the next verse still makes it cleare; *but them that are without God judgeth, therefore put away from your selves that wicked person*: Here *Paul* judges, and the Church doth judge; judging then here is excommunication, I see I am not alone in my notion, but upon search I found some others who back me in my interpretation. *Piscator* is plaine, his second Aphorisme (as he calls it) is this; *Excommunicatio est judicium seu decretum, seu denique sententiæ dictio, colligitur ex verbis Apostoli*, ver. 3. *Ego judicavi jam ut præsens. Item.* ver. 12. *Nonne de eis qui intus sunt, vos judicatis?* So also *Pareus* upon the word *judicatis*; *Docet igitur censuras Ecclesiasticas non stringendas in extraneos, sed circa eos, qui cum intra Ecclesiæ pomeria versentur, tamen ut extraneos se gerunt, exercendas esse.* This judging then he understands to be Church Censures, but this judging is to be referred to *ver.* 11.

Further, I desire any Christian to consider, whether they think the Apostle would have Christians to have intimate familiarity with a Heathen that was a Fornicator, Drunkard, &c? Is there not danger of a Christian who shall familiarly converse with a Heathen, whose mouth is full of uncleane filthy

thy ſpeeches, and baſe geſtures? ſo to be in a Drunkards company, to ſit quaffing with ſuch a one, is there not danger though he be a Heathen? if you ſay, yes ſure, we ought to take heed of all occaſions of ſinne, our hearts are as tinder to the ſparkes; therefore intimate familiarity is to be avoyded with ſuch: Then I ſay, if *no not to eate*, be meant only of intimate civill familiarity, then *Paul* did judge thoſe who were without, as well, and as much, as thoſe who were within, and he makes no difference between the judging of the one and the other, but this twelfth verſe ſaith, He had nothing to doe with thoſe who were without.

Further, this judging doth imply ſome power and authority put forth upon the perſons judged, in *ver.* 11. here is the act of Rulers, the Officers of the Church, together with the fraternity conſenting with the Officers; in excommunication this is ſeene indeed, but not in the denying of civill intimate familiarity with one, which I can alſo deny to one, over whom I have no power nor authority.

This diſcourſe I have run into by occaſion of my laſt anſwer to the Objection, ſo that for the preſent I am not much moved with the Argument: though I know it is that which is moſt uſed; I hope ſome others will give better anſwers, preſuming that ſince they practiſe as they doe, and have beene longer at their ſtudies then I have been, they are better furniſhed then I am with arguments to defend their practiſe.

There is but one more Objection, and that is commonly uſed; if you practiſe thus, you will make abundance in *England*, and in your Pariſh, to be no better then Heathens. *Object.*

I anſwer; Thouſands of our people are ſuſpended from the Lords Supper many yeares together, and your ſuſpenſion is *excommunicatio minor*; follow home your Diſcipline, and I doubt you muſt come to excommunicate thouſands, and if ſo, you will make them as Heathens; you doe a great deale towards it. I *Anſw.*

2 I doe not looke upon all thoſe whoſe children I admit not to Baptiſme as Heathens, but as Church-members in a large ſenſe, through want of Catechizing and Diſcipline, over-grown with ignorance and profaneneſſe, I conceive they have a fundamentall or remote right (as I may ſay) to the bap-

tiſme of their children, yea and to the Lords Supper, you muſt not deny it, if you owne them to be Church-members, however cuſtome hath prevailed to the excluſion of them from it, without regular proceeding, and labouring to bring them to repentance; and that I doe not look at them as Heathen, &c. this is one demonſtration, for ſuch as I doe now refuſe to baptize, it may be the next childe God giveth the Party I doe baptize it, the Parent gives now ſome better hopes then before, his converſation is more reformed, &c. but this parent I doe not baptize, which I ſhould doe if I looked on him as a Heathen, and no member of a Church, being he was not excommunicated. Heathens, and non-members of Churches (who were never excommunicated) when they are taken into a Church, they are baptized; and thus it is in *New England*, thoſe whom they take into their Churches; they doe not baptize againe [the parents I meane.] The Anabaptiſts who deny the Churches of *England*, doe ſo indeed.

3 Since then our Churches through want of Catechizing, and Diſcipline, are growne thus ignorant and corrupt, and to exerciſe Diſcipline it is very hard, the perſons are numerous, who are as the Queſtion mentions: I propound this Queſtion; *Whether it were not better for the Miniſters of* England, *as they doe ſuſpend perſons from the Lords Supper, ſo alſo for a time to ſuſpend them from baptizing of their Children, and in the meane time, Miniſters to follow Catechizing cloſe, and labour to reforme them from a ſcandalous converſation, by all the gentle perſwaſions, and meekneſſe of wiſdome, which God ſhall give us; that ſo when by our Catechizing they have gotten knowledge, and we finde the Word have ſo much power as to rectifie their converſations, we may then with more comfort give this Ordinance?*

A queſtion propounded.

My ſhallow head cannot thinke of any way to reforme our Congregations but this, and ſurely if all Miniſters did thus, it would make people more to looke about them; this may we doe, and the Civill Power will backe Miniſters in ſo doing, and not ſuffer their maintenance to be kept from them by ſuch as you ſhall for a time thus ſuſpend (as I have experience) and this muſt be acknowledged to be a great mercy we enjoy, though we have many diſcouragements from the errours and ſchiſmes of the times.

I tell my people, I doe not absolutely deny to baptize their Children, but desire them to forbeare a while, and if they wil answer me in the Assembly as others doe, or come to my house and be Catechized there, so that they may get knowledge, and if they will reforme their conversations from scandalous walking, set up religious duties as well as they can in their Families, and subject themselves to Discipline, then I will doe it.

If any say *I* have overthrown my selfe in affirming all to be Church-members; they may answer themselves by what I have said before, we receive them indeed from our Predecessors, who owned them for such and baptized all, and it is but faintly that I acknowledge it, and I say *de facto* they are so esteemed, but *de jure* they ought not to be so; only they are so numerous that now we come to Reformation, we know not what to do, therefore I go this way, as the mildest course I can take.

Obj. *If you say this doth but draw men into a formality of religion.* *Object.*

I answer, if a man shall professe this unto me, that God hath made him see himselfe utterly undone without Christ, and so doth trust and rest upon Christ for salvation, and to this profession the things I mentioned are adjoyned, *viz.* Competent knowledge, conversation not scandalous, sets up religious duties in the family, and subjects to Discipline; I look upon such a one as a visible Saint, and I am confident such a person should have been received in the Apostles times. *Answ.*

Those who contemne this, and must have stricter rules to go by, Let them set pen to paper, if their arguments be cogent I will yeeld, if not, somebody will be ready to answer them. I had rather grapple with those who think I am too large [as there are some about me, but I cannot get them to disputation] then with those who judge me to be too streight.

Concerning this suspension from both the Sacraments for a time, though I confesse the *Leyden* Professours are against me, *disp.* 44. *th.* 50. unto which I conceive some answer hath been given in my former discourse: Yet *Disp.* 48. they seem to allow this, at the 27 *Thesis*, there is a question moved, whether if there be a great multitude in the Church, who offend in doctrine or life, may we now use excommunication, or exclu- Synopf. par. Theol.

sion from the Sacraments? the reason of the question they give, in the 28 *Thes:* they seem to be for non-communion, a secession from them if overgrowne with heresie; but as to the life in *Thes:* 31. they give their answer. I shall rehearse it, beginning about the midst of the Thesis. *Sed si ecclesiæ Rectores plerique in bonum conspirent, existimo, ejusmodi hominibus apertè & contumaciter corruptis quantalibet sit multitudo, ab iisdem Pastoribus divinæ gratiæ Sacramenta communicari nec posse nec debere, sed unanimi consensu iis esse neganda, & Deo eventum commendandum; quia pii Pastores signa gratiæ iis Communicare non possunt, quibus Christus ea apertè negat, & ne communicentur prohibet; & quia exempla in ecclesiis nostri temporis reperiri possunt, ubi ejusmodi negatio publica, in publica morum corruptela, medium fuit & instrumentum, quo ecclesia ad meliorem statum sit reducta, & morum major integritas revocata.*

Whereas they say *Sacramenta*, and *Signa gratiæ*, they must needs include baptisme, for they owned but two Sacraments, and thus it seems they have done, and found good successe. I am mistaken if they speak not the very thing, I have been pleading for.

Thus I have troubled the Reader, in giving account of my actions, I trust I shall not be offensive to any of my reverend Fathers or Brethren, if I hold on my practice till I see these grounds removed. I hope I have not so handled the question, as to deserve a sharp Answer, I have endeavoured to give all due respect to those Ministers who I see practise otherwise then I doe, esteeming their holinesse, gifts, and learning far beyond mine. Willing I am to receive light from others, and shal readily lay down my opinion and practise when I see strength of Argument compels me; it is no temptation to me, to fall on the charitable side, but I shall leave the controversie to more able heads and better hearts.

The mercifull Lord once againe return to his Ordinances, that we may see his goings in his Sanctuary, as we have seen heretofore, and grant that pure Ordinances and pure hearts may meet together.

FINIS.